

THE
CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

OCTOBER, 1870.

I.—CONFIRMATION.

1. *Morning Visits to the Rector's Study on Confirmation.* By W. E. WYATT, D. D.
2. *The Candidate for Confirmation Instructed, etc.* By JOHN HENRY HOBART, D. D.
3. *A Plain Tract on Confirmation.* By C. T. QUINTARD, D. D.
4. *The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.*
5. "*And he [Paul] went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the Churches.*" Acts xv, 41.

CEREMONIAL Confirmation is one of the seven sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church. Rejected by the Greek Church, it has been adopted by the Anglican and Lutheran bodies, both in Europe and America. It consists in the imposition of a Bishop's hands, and the invocation of a Divine blessing upon the candidate, who has been prepared for the ceremony by previous baptism and a certain course of instruction, prescribed by the authorities of the Church. The following is the order of confirmation, as presented in the American *Book of Common Prayer*:

"Upon the day appointed, all that are to be then confirmed, being placed, and standing in order before the Bishop, he, or some other minister appointed by him, shall read this preface following:

"To the end that confirmation may be ministered to the more edifying of such as shall receive it, the Church hath thought good to order, That none shall be confirmed but such as can say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments; and can also answer to such other questions as in the Short Catechism

are contained; which order is very convenient to be observed; to the end, that children, being now come to the years of discretion, and having learned what their Godfathers and Godmothers promised for them in baptism, may themselves, with their own mouth and consent, openly before the Church ratify and confirm the same; and also promise, that, by the grace of God, they will evermore endeavor themselves faithfully to observe such things as they, by their own confession, have assented unto.

"Then shall the Bishop say:

"Do ye here, in the presence of God, and of this congregation, renew the solemn promise and vow that ye made, or that was made in your name, at your baptism; ratifying and confirming the same; and acknowledging yourselves bound to believe and to do all those things which ye then undertook, or your sponsors then undertook for you?

"And every one shall audibly answer, I do.

"Bishop. Our help is in the name of the Lord,

"Answer. Who hath made heaven and earth.

"Bishop. Blessed be the name of the Lord;

"Answer. Henceforth, world without end.

"Bishop. Lord, hear our prayer,

"Answer. And let our cry come unto thee.

"Bishop. Let us pray.

"Almighty and ever-living God, who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these thy servants by water and the Holy Ghost, and hast given unto them forgiveness of all their sins; strengthen them, we beseech thee, O Lord, with the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, and daily increase in them thy manifold gifts of grace: the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and ghostly strength, the spirit of knowledge and true godliness; and fill them, O Lord, with the spirit of thy holy fear, now and forever. Amen.

"Then all of them in order kneeling before the Bishop, he shall lay his hands upon the heads of every one severally, saying,

"Defend, O Lord, this thy child (or this thy servant) with thy heavenly grace; that he may continue thine forever, and daily increase in thy Holy Spirit, more and more, until he come unto thy everlasting kingdom. Amen.

"Then shall the Bishop say,

"The Lord be with you,

"Answer. And with thy spirit.

"And all kneeling down, the Bishop shall add,

"Let us pray."

Then follows the Lord's prayer. After the prayer the Bishop says two collects, which we subjoin:

FIRST COLLECT.

"Almighty and ever-living God, who makest us both to will and to do those things which are good and acceptable unto thy Divine Majesty; We make our humble supplications unto thee for these thy servants, upon whom, after the exam-

ple of thy holy apostles, we have now laid our hands, to certify them, by this sign, of thy favor and gracious goodness toward them. Let thy Fatherly hand, we beseech thee, ever be over them; let thy Holy Spirit ever be with them, and so lead them in the knowledge and obedience of thy Word, that, in the end, they may obtain everlasting life, through our Lord Jesus Christ, who with thee and the Holy Ghost liveth and reigneth, our one God, world without end. *Amen.*"

SECOND COLLECT.

"O Almighty Lord, and everlasting God, vouchsafe, we beseech thee, to direct, sanctify, and govern both our hearts and bodies, in the ways of thy laws, and in the works of thy commandments, that, through thy most mighty protection, both here and ever, we may be preserved in body and soul, through our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. *Amen.*

"Then the Bishop shall bless them, saying thus,

"The blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the *Holy Ghost* be upon you and remain forever with you. *Amen.*

"And there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed."

The difference between the Papal doctrine and that of the Protestant Churches who practice this rite is thus expressed by Bishop Hobart:

"If confirmation is an ordinance of divine appointment, and a means and pledge of grace, the question may occur, Why does not our Church consider it as a sacrament, according to the opinion of the Church of Rome? To this we answer that our Church deems one essential of a sacrament 'an outward and a visible sign'—that is, the use of some material substance denoting 'an inward and spiritual grace.' Her authority for this is that there are outward and visible signs in baptism and the Lord's-Supper—water in the one, and bread and wine in the other. There is no such sign in confirmation. . . . The word 'sign,' in the office of confirmation, denotes the gesture of laying on of hands."

HISTORY OF OPINION.

It is claimed by those who regard confirmation as a ceremonial institution, that it was established by the Apostles; that it was practiced by the early Church, defended by the Fathers, and handed down, with more or less modification, through all the ages, from the apostolic to the present.

Tertullian, who lived in the second century, speaks of it as a practice universally prevailing. "Hands were laid upon them by benediction, calling for and invoking the Holy Ghost."* "The flesh is overcome by the imposition of hands, that it may be enlightened by the Spirit."†

*Tertullian de Bap.

†Tertul. de resur. carnis.

Cyprian, who lived in the next century, traces the origin of confirmation to the imposition of hands by the Apostles. "They who believed in Samaria were baptized, prayer was said over them, and hands laid upon them, that the Holy Ghost might be invoked and poured upon them, which is still the custom with us. They who are baptized into the Church are solemnly dedicated by the Bishops of the Church, and receive the Holy Ghost by the imposition of hands."*

To the same purpose Jerome testifies: "As for them who are baptized afar off in the lesser towns by Presbyters and Deacons, the Bishop travels out to them, to lay hands upon them, and to invoke the Holy Spirit."†

"Confirmation could not have universally prevailed at so early a period if it had not been practiced by the Apostles."—*Bishop Hobart*.

John Calvin, in his commentary on the Hebrews, says: "When they (the children of believers, baptized in their infancy) were established in these necessary truths, and had resolved on personal obedience unto the Gospel, they were offered unto the fellowship of the faithful; and here, on giving the same account of their faith and repentance which others had done before they were baptized, they were admitted into the communion of the Church, the Elders thereof laying their hands on them in token of their acceptance, and praying for their confirmation in the faith."

It is claimed by English and American Bishops that this extract from the works of Calvin proves that he was a believer in the rite as practiced by the Church of England. It would appear, however, from his writings, that, although he regarded the ancient custom of benediction pronounced upon the youth, accompanied with laying on of hands, as a good thing, he did not regard it as an indispensable ceremony. He says: "Such an imposition of hands as this, which is used purely as a blessing, I very much approve of, and wish it were now restored to its pure and primitive uses."

"Churchmen" likewise quote St. Cyril, of Jerusalem (A. D. 350): "To you, in like manner, after you have come up from the waters of baptism, the unction (confirmation) is given by the antitype of which Christ was anointed," etc.

* Cyprian ad Iub., Ep. 73.

† Hierony. Dialog. adversus Luciferianos.

Eusebius, of Emissa (A. D. 350): "In baptism the Holy Spirit, which descendeth with saving influence, gives us sufficient for innocence, but in confirmation he gives increase of our grace."

Amphilochius, of Iconium, says that "Maximin, the Bishop, baptized Basil and Ebulus together, and vested them in white, gave them the unction of confirmation, and received them to the communion."

St. Augustine, the great African Bishop, says: "We acknowledge imposition of hands, with prayer, that they which are so taught might receive strength of God's Spirit so to continue."

Again: "In baptism the Spirit is given to consecrate an habitation to God; in confirmation to declare that these twofold graces of the Holy Ghost are come to us with a fullness of sanctity, wisdom, and virtue." (De Trinit., lib. xv, chap. 26.)

St. Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, (A. D. 400,) interprets the doctrine of the laying on of hands to be the receiving of the Holy Ghost, given by imposition of hands.

Gennadius, Presbyter of Marseilles, (A. D. 500,) says: "If they be infants that are baptized, let those who bring them answer for them, according to usual mode, and then, in one time, let them be admitted to the Holy Communion by imposition of hands."

RELATIVE POSITION AND IMPORTANCE.

The relative position of this ceremony in the estimation of its advocates may be thus expressed: 1. Baptism (infant and adult); 2. Confirmation; 3. Holy Communion. This arrangement, presented to the eye of the reader, gives a very clear idea of the theory of the Fathers, and the opinion of those who have followed them in regard to this ordinance. A single quotation from Bishop Quintard's tract will exhibit this in a most lucid manner. He says (pp. 7, 8):

"The Episcopal Church holds confirmation to be one of the 'principles of the doctrine of Christ,' and whenever a child is brought to her to be baptized the minister is directed to say to those who bring it, 'Ye are to take care that this child be brought to the Bishop, to be confirmed by him, so soon as he can say the creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and is sufficiently instructed in the other parts of the Church Catechism set forth for that purpose.' Further, 'There shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion until such time as he be confirmed,' etc.; and, moreover, in reference to the ministration of baptism to those of riper years there is the following rubric: 'It is expedient for every person thus baptized that he should be confirmed by the Bishop so soon after his baptism as conveniently may be, that *so he may be admitted* to the Holy Communion.'"

IF CONFIRMATION IS A POSITIVE INSTITUTION, CAN WE DISPENSE
WITH IT?

According to the eminent ecclesiastical authorities, beginning with Tertullian, proceeding with all the Fathers, continuing with all the hierarchies of Rome and England, and ending with the learned Bishops of the Episcopal Church of the United States, it appears that confirmation is a positive institution. The imposition of hands—of the hands of a Bishop—upon one suitably prepared constitutes the visible material of the ordinance; the vow of the candidate is the leading moral element. From the stand-point of reason there may be no objection to this rite. We confess that it is imposing and beautiful. We have often been impressed by the earnestness and solemnity exhibited on the occasion of a large confirmation. It bears a close resemblance to the ceremonial institutes of Christianity, and does not appear to the eye of reason to be incompatible with any of the provisions of the Gospel. The only question for us to examine is this: Has it the authority of the Word of God? If it has, we can not set it aside. It must stand with baptism and the Lord's-Supper.

Let us then candidly examine the law and the testimony. We must respectfully decline adopting the opinions of the Fathers, the opinions of the learned councils, or the opinions of any of the modern writers on this subject. Moreover, we must enter our protest against the maxim incautiously adopted by vast numbers of intelligent men, that whatever in the early ages of the Church was believed or practiced—"*Semper et ubique et ab omnibus*"—*always, every-where, and by all*, must be true, and must have been derived from the Apostles. Grant this maxim to be correct, and Christianity is at once demoralized. Its divinity is immolated. Its spirit is crushed. It becomes a human system, tossed about with every wind of doctrine, and subject to the whims and caprices of cunning men. No intelligent Christian, who reverences the Word of God, can suffer himself to be duped into the belief of such a dangerous sentiment; but he will always say, "Let God be true, though every man be a liar." Yes, we adopt with all our heart the principle which no one can call in question. Whatever was taught by the Apostles, and enjoined upon the primitive Church as an essential truth or as an essential duty, is binding upon Christians in all ages. The Church itself, in the very

days of the Apostles, was constantly falling into error, constantly going after idols. And it required the diligence and watchful care of the Apostles to keep the primitive Christians out of heresy.

What is meant by the *early ages* of the Church? The expression is somewhat vague, but we presume it means several centuries, perhaps three or more, beginning with the post Apostolic age, A. D. 100, and reaching down to the days of St. Augustine, who lived and died in the fifth century.

Now, we affirm that during this period there were many strange doctrines of men and demons entertained by the Fathers and their disciples, contrary to the doctrines of Christ; and if the maxim of "*Semper, ubique et ab omnibus*" be true, Christianity, for several centuries after the Apostles, was the strangest medley of sense and nonsense ever exhibited on earth.

We have always regarded this maxim as a cunning device of the man of sin for the purpose of sustaining the claims of the great apostasy; and all the episcopal bodies that have adopted it have done so without due regard to the supreme authority of the Word of God. If we mistake not, every one of the epistles is directed against this law given to the world by the great Antichrist, and in defense of the pure principle for which we contend.

When Paul wrote his letter to the Romans, the whole Christian world had gone astray on the Jewish question. "*Semper, ubique et ab omnibus*," it was the opinion that the Jew was the favorite of Heaven. The Word of God, by the Apostle Paul, corrected the falsehood. When the same inspired teacher wrote to the Corinthians, it was fast becoming a prevalent opinion that there was no resurrection of the dead, and had not the Apostle, moved by the Holy Spirit, put forth his powerful logic, as presented in his first epistle (fifteenth chapter), it would have been a settled doctrine, "*Semper, ubique et ab omnibus*," that man is a very respectable animal, whom God has made to live and die and live no more.

When he addressed the Churches of Galatia he found that, "*Semper, ubique et ab omnibus*," throughout that region there was a falling away. "I marvel," says he, "that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ, unto another gospel, which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the Gospel of Christ."

Now for the infallible rule. Hear it, O ye teachers! who defend Patristic theology: "But though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached, let him be accursed."

After writing his first letter to the Thessalonians it was, "*Semper, ubique et ab omnibus*," believed that the Lord would come immediately. To correct this false impression he wrote his second epistle, and informed them that the day of the Lord would not come "except there come a falling away first, and the man of sin be revealed, who opposeth himself and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped."

In writing to Timothy it appears, from his own statement, that "*Semper, ubique et ab omnibus*," in Asia there was a turning away from him, and they were giving heed to fables and endless genealogies. Furthermore, it seems that the good Apostle, with prophetic vision, anticipated the Patristic speculations when, "*Semper, ubique et ab omnibus*," sound doctrine would not be endured, but when men "should heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears, and they shall turn away their ears from the truth and be turned unto fables."

What is the antidote? Read it, ye lover of fables and uninspired theology: "Continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; and that from a child *thou hast known the Holy Scriptures*, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus." Then follows that glorious maxim, which, if adopted, "*Semper, ubique et ab omnibus*," would dash the demon of sectarianism from its throne, and hurl it, like a mill-stone, into the depths of the sea. Read it, we beseech you, all ye men of the modern pulpit, who bless God for divisions, and thank him that men can be suited in their religious tastes, as the monthly fashion-monger suits the caprices of the multitude! Read it, and know that God's thoughts and God's ways are not like your thoughts and your ways!

"All Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

To this testimony from the epistles of Paul we add that afforded

by reading the brief history of the seven Churches of Asia Minor. If, during a very few years, less, perhaps, than a quarter of a century, five of these Churches had widely departed from the faith, while the Apostles were living; if they were wandering away from the truth which they had learned from the inspired teachers; if Ephesus had left her first love; if Pergamos entertained Balaamites and Nicolaitans; if Thyatira held in her fellowship the wicked Jezebel; if Sardis had a name to live and was dead; if Laodicea was lukewarm—if, I say, all this apostasy was going on under the very teaching of the Apostles, and required the solemn warning of the Spirit administered by the beloved John from the isle of Patmos, is it not quite probable that in after ages, yes, in the very early ages of the Church, men would depart from the faith, give heed to fables, fall into heresy, and deny the very Lord that bought them?

What, then, was the fact during the first four centuries of the Christian era? We answer that, "*Semper, ubique et ab omnibus*," the Churches planted by the Apostles and Evangelists were subjected to the same evil influences which were felt prior to their decease. False doctrine prevailed; not only was it preached, but it was received and practiced. Men did actually heap to themselves teachers having itching ears; they did turn away their ears from the truth, and devoted themselves to a vain and foolish philosophy. Antichrist commenced his work before the death of the Apostles, and he has been working ever since.

During these early ages, extending from the death of John down to the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451, Christianity was subjected to all the corrupting influences of Judaism, Platonism, Pagan skepticism, and Patristic theology. More than this, we affirm that in all the Grand Councils of the so-called Church, there was more of human wisdom and human speculation than of Apostolic lore. The members of all these Ecumenical Councils were better acquainted with the commentaries of Tertullian and Jerome and Cyprian than with the plain epistolary writings of Paul, Peter, and John.

As a specimen of a doctrine which prevailed in the fourth and fifth centuries, and, indeed, has prevailed ever since, we may mention the Augustinian theory of sin:

"The Churches teach [mark, the *Churches*, not the Scriptures] that after the fall of Adam, all men, propagated according to ordinary generation, are born with

sin ; that is, without the fear of God, without trust in God, and with concupiscence, and that this disease is truly sin, damning, and bringing eternal death upon those *who are not regenerated by baptism and the Holy Spirit.*"

From this extract it will be seen that, at an early age, the doctrine of *baptismal regeneration* (sacramental grace), as advocated now by the Romish and Anglican Churches, prevailed. In a word, it was, for centuries, entertained as a cardinal truth, "*Semper, ubique et ab omnibus.*" Can any intelligent Christian believe that it was taught by the Apostles? Can any true disciple of the Apostolic school believe that it was handed down? No, no! It was invented after the Apostles retired to their rest.

And what shall we say of infant immersion, of transubstantiation, of diocesan episcopacy, of clerical authority in general, of sacramental grace in all its forms, and various other errors? Did they not prevail, in a germinal form, in the early ages of the Church? Indeed, is it not the boast of the Papal institution at this very day, that she has preserved all the doctrine, all the ordinances, all the sacraments, all the appointments of the Patristic Church? And does not this grand apostasy claim the authorship of the maxim, against which we would make unrelenting opposition, in order to enforce her authority, and lead men from the knowledge of the truth as it is in Christ, and direct their steps into the paths of sin, Satan, and destruction?

WHAT SHALL BE OUR GUIDE?

Shall the Apostles of the Blessed One direct us in our investigation, or the apostles of an erring Church? Shall we take the writings of Paul, or the writings of Tertullian? Shall we adopt the practice of the Churches planted by Paul, or that of the Churches planted by Cyprian?

ACTS OF APOSTLES.

This book contains the only reliable record, in historical form, of the doings of the Apostles and their associates; and as it is universally accepted throughout the world as an authentic narrative of their *preaching, baptizing, and confirming*, we shall make it the principal book of reference in support of the views presented in this essay. In connection with this authority, we shall also make some reference to the Apostolic epistles.

CONFIRMATION IS TAUGHT IN ACTS OF APOSTLES—COLLOQUY.

Let us suppose that we are in the study of an Episcopal rector (where, indeed, we have often been, and where we have enjoyed many a pleasant visit), and let us, for the sake of presenting this subject fully before the mind of the reader, reproduce a colloquy which has really occurred :

Rector. Then, friend B., I understand that you deny confirmation, do you?

B. No, sir, I do not. I deny nothing taught in the Word of God.

Rector. You admit, then, that confirmation is taught in the Scriptures?

B. Most assuredly I do. It is recorded (Acts xv, 41) that Paul went through Syria and Cilicia *confirming* the Churches. Further, that Paul and Barnabas had an extensive *confirmation* (Acts xiv, 21, 22) in Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch; that Judas and Silas also held a *confirmation* at Antioch (Acts xv, 32), and that Paul went over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia *confirming* the disciples (Acts xvii, 23).

Rector. Surely, my dear sir, you have afforded abundant testimony on this subject yourself, to convince any unprejudiced mind. How is it possible, then, that you can doubt?

B. I have no doubt at all, friend Rector; on the contrary, I am well satisfied that Paul and his co-laborers did confirm the disciples, and I am very well satisfied that they did not do it by the imposition of hands.

Rector. Well, I have been educated to believe that confirmation, as practiced by the Church (the imposition of a Bishop's hands, and his attendant blessing), is very distinctly taught in the Scriptures, and that it is the solemn duty of all who have been baptized to come forward and submit to this ordinance before coming to the communion.

B. I received no education on this subject at all. I have no prejudices on the subject. I see no rational objection to it. It has the appearance of a Christian ceremony, and the only question before us is simply this, *Has it the authority of the Word of God?*

Rector. Very well, friend B.; search the Scriptures, and then search the Fathers, and I think you will be convinced that our

Church teaches the whole truth on this matter. Remember, we hold that the ordinance was instituted by the Apostles (Acts viii, 17; xix, 6; Hebrews vi, 2); that it was observed by the Fathers, and has been practiced by the Church, without intermission, through every subsequent age. It is one of the "first principles of the doctrine of Christ," fundamental in its importance, universal in its application, and, if neglected in youth, it is still binding in mature age. Further, we contend that none but Bishops have a right to confirm, and none have a right to come to confirmation except those who have been baptized. St. Paul confirmed in Syria and Cilicia many who were doubtless baptized in infancy, and many who received the ordinance in adult life. The same occurred in Ephesus. The baptism was performed by other ministers, but the confirmation by an Apostle. The Bishop, being a successor of an Apostle, is entitled to the privilege—neither a priest nor deacon can officiate.

B. I promise you, dear Rector, that I will re-examine the whole subject, and commit the result of my investigation to paper, and, perhaps, to the public.

We have fulfilled our promise, and now present to the reader our course of reading and argument.

PHILOLOGICAL VIEW.

The Greek word of most frequent occurrence rendered by *confirm* is *Ἐπιστηρίζω*. It is thus rendered in the best lexicons: To cause to stand firmly upon; *metonym*, to confirm, strengthen, establish.

Another verb of similar import is *Στερεόω*, which is rendered to make firm, to strengthen, to confirm.

Another is *Βεβαιόω*, to establish, to render constant and unwavering, to strengthen by argument, to ratify.

Still another is *Κυρώω*, to convince, to sanction, to prove, to ratify, to confirm.

We have presented them in their relative importance in this discussion. The first on the list (*epistēridzoō*) is used in all the places in Acts of Apostles, namely, chapters xiv, xv, and xviii, where it would seem, to the advocates of the ceremony, that some visible act was performed. The second (*stereōō*) is used in Acts iii, 7-16, to express physical strength, and in Acts xvi, 5, to convey the idea of strengthening the mind. The remaining two are used in various places in

the epistles, and we believe the only idea presented is the establishment of the mind in the truth.

An abstract philological examination can not afford entire satisfaction on this or any kindred subject. Whatever may be the original and literal import of any of these Greek words, the question remains open for examination. Limiting our observation to the Apostolic period, and, with due respect for our opponents, rejecting Patristic authority, we suggest, as the only safe course,

THE HISTORICAL METHOD.

We insist on this method, because it must give satisfaction to every unprejudiced mind, and because it is the only possible method of arriving at the truth. Our chronology embraces only some fifty or sixty years, and our historical question is simply this: How did the Apostles practice confirmation?

For the sake of amplifying, we may ask a number of questions:

1. What ministers confirmed? Apostles only, or others besides?
2. Who were confirmed? The new converts, or others also?
3. How were they confirmed? By imposition of hands, or by some other method?
4. Why were they confirmed?—that is, for what purpose?
5. How often were they confirmed? Once only, or often?

For the solution of these questions we appeal to the history of the labors of the Apostles.

THE FOUNDING OF THE CHURCH—THE BEGINNING AT JERUSALEM.

The *proclamation* of the Gospel of Christ by the Apostle Peter, on the day of Pentecost, was the signal for a grand conflict with the powers of hell and earth. It was the commencement of a grand enrolling of soldiers of the Cross. Peter's first sermon was a bold challenge to the world to fight. A grand council of the Jews had condemned the Messiah, and the great Roman government had indorsed the act, and put him to death. This condemned, crucified, and buried criminal God had raised from the dead. Yea, he had exalted him at his own right hand to be a Prince and a Savior, and to grant repentance and remission of sins to Jew and Gentile. Through him, and through him alone, and by his own appointed way alone, could salvation be obtained. The despised and the rejected of men was the

loved and the chosen of God. The Man of Sorrows and of Grief no longer poured forth his sighs in Gethsemane, praying his Father to remove the bitter cup. He had endured the cross, despised the shame, and was seated on the right hand of the Majesty on high. He had sent the promised Spirit to guide the minds of his Apostles. Filled with this Spirit, Peter, on Pentecost, announced the Messiah, the Christ, as the Way, the Truth, and the Life. He reproduced the confession which he had made at Cæsarea Philippi, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." This was the creed of the Church. To believe it, to repent, to confess the Christ, and to be baptized, were the terms of admission every-where announced by the inspired teachers. Hence, after Pentecost, not only at Jerusalem, but in Samaria and throughout the uttermost parts of the earth, to Jews and Greeks, the same creed was presented, the same confession required, and the same terms stipulated.

THE POWER OF SATAN.

Every-where the Word of the Lord grew, and thousands and tens of thousands were enlisted in the army of the faithful, and they continued steadfast in the Apostle's doctrine, in the fellowship, in the breaking of bread, and in prayers. But soon, very soon, Satan arrayed his forces. He had tried his power on the Son of God while here on earth, and had the boldness to ask him to bow down and worship him. Foiled by the majesty and the holiness of the Savior, he retired from the wilderness a whipped general, determined to renew the effort. The crucifixion and burial was another contest—the resurrection another triumph. And now after the glorious Sufferer had passed the ordeal, had demonstrated his divinity to angels in heaven and chosen men on earth—after ascending to the throne of his glory and beginning the great work of reconciliation—Satan assaults the King on his throne, by moving wicked ministers on this his footstool. He persuaded the Greek that the Gospel was foolishness; he persuaded the Jew that it was a stumbling-block, and, more than all, he persuaded the faltering, timid Christian that Jesus was not the Christ that there was no resurrection from the dead, no heaven, no eternal life. In a word, he was going about practicing his old profession—*lying*.

But the Apostles were on the alert. The Spirit of God apprised

them of the doings of the adversary. They met him in every city, and fought him at every step of their progress. Wherever they discomfited Satan, they established the brethren in the faith. They CONFIRMED them! Did Satan say by his ministers, Jesus is not the Christ, and overthrow the faith of some? The Apostles and Evangelists would prove that he was the Christ, and *confirm* the brethren in their faith.

Did Satan say, "Ye must be circumcised and obey the law of Moses?" The Apostles settled the question, gave quiet to the controversy, and *confirmed* the brethren in the faith. Did they do it by the imposition of hands? Let the facts of our historical books decide.

In Acts xiv, 21, 22, it is recorded that Paul and Barnabas returned from Derbe to Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch, "*confirming* the souls of the disciples." How? By "exhorting them to continue in the faith." The little particle "*and*" is an interpolation. Leaving it out, we have the full force of the passage, and the Greek word *episteerizontes* (confirming), is interpreted in the very same passage by a very plain participle, *parakalountes*, which means calling upon, inviting, persuading, exhorting, beseeching, imploring, consoling, but never conveying the idea of imposing hands.

We turn next to Acts xv, 32, where it is recorded that Judas and Silas, being prophets, exhorted the brethren with many words, and confirmed them (*epesteerixan*.) They exhorted the brethren, and, by *exhorting*, *confirmed* them.

Let us now give attention to Acts xv, 41: "And he [Paul] went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming (*episteeridzoon*) the Churches." It is distinctly asserted by our Episcopal friends that Paul laid his hands on the young converts—those who had been baptized—and throughout Syria and Cilicia the young candidates were thus admitted to the Holy Communion.

Let us examine the history, and let us do it without prejudice. The two cases we have here presented from Acts xv fall together. The confirming ministers were associates—Judas and Silas, Paul and Barnabas. The subjects confirmed occupied the same moral standpoint. The authority was the same, the reason and the necessity were the same, the results were the same, and, beyond any question, the method of confirmation in one place, one town, or one city was the method every-where.

We turn, then, to the narrative in the fifteenth chapter of Acts, and ascertain that "certain men which came down from Judea taught the brethren, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye can not be saved." It was determined, after some disputation on the subject, that Paul and Barnabas, and others, should go up to Jerusalem, and have the question settled by a convention of the Apostles and Elders.

Accordingly they went up. The Apostles were convened. The subject was laid before them. Speeches were made by Peter, by Barnabas and Paul, and by James. The advice of James was adopted, doubtless under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and the assembly sent out, by chosen men, a circular letter, a copy of which we here present :

"The Apostles and Elders and brethren send greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia: Forasmuch as we have heard that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised and keep the law, to whom we gave no such commandment, it seemed good unto us, being assembled with one accord, to send chosen men unto you with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.

"We have sent, therefore, Judas and Silas, who shall also tell you the same things by mouth. For it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things: that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which, if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well."

When they were dismissed they all (Paul and Barnabas, Judas and Silas) went immediately to Antioch, called the Church together, read the letter to the brethren, and there was joy among them for the consolation which the letter gave. The dispute was settled. *Then, at that very juncture of time*, Judas and Silas, being simply prophets, teachers—not Bishops, not Apostles—exhorted the brethren with many words, and *confirmed* them. Was there any ceremony here? Was any ceremony needed? Where is the room for sacramental grace?

But we have not done with our analysis. We desire, if possible,

to make it exhaustive. We invite attention to our very short catechism of five questions, with as many supplementary questions as may be necessary. In this instance, then, at Antioch, let us inquire,

Q. What ministers confirmed?

A. Judas and Silas, who, we suppose, were evangelists.

Q. But does not the Romish and Anglican Church each one contend that a Bishop only, being a successor of the Apostles, has the privilege to confirm?

A. Yes, but the Romish Church departed from the faith, and the Anglican Church adopted several of her errors.

Q. Who were confirmed at Antioch?

A. The whole Church. We must examine the history somewhat more closely, and ascertain all the important facts connected with this Antioch confirmation. It must be noted that there were two Antiochs—one in Pisidia, some distance from the sea; the other in Syria, near the sea. The confirmation spoken of in Acts xiv, 22, was evidently at Antioch in Pisidia. The one which we are now contemplating was at Antioch in Syria. The early history of the planting and training of this Church is given in the eleventh chapter, where, among other things, it is stated that for a whole year—long after the introduction of the Gospel—long after a great number had believed and turned to the Lord—Barnabas and Paul assembled themselves with the Church, and taught much people. And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch. In the great dearth that took place some time subsequent to the events of the year, just alluded to, these Christians sent contributions to the brethren dwelling in Judea. This shows that they were a working congregation. In a few words, they had believed the Gospel, had repented of their sins, had been baptized, had been assembling as a Church, and, what is very remarkable, *they had all been admitted to the Holy Communion.* On every Lord's day they had assembled and celebrated the death and sufferings of the Messiah by partaking of the emblems of his broken body and shed blood. And then many persons were confirmed by Judas and Silas, Paul and Barnabas standing by, and, so far as we can judge from the record, not saying a word. They doubtless indorsed the confirmation. So far, then, from confirmation coming in between baptism and communion, most evidently it

comes in after communion. Our Episcopal friends have put it in the wrong place. It is a striking fact that when a Church begins to blunder, she rarely stops at one wrong move. The Church of England adopted Rome's infant baptism (putting the institution before faith), and it was an easy matter to adopt the confirmation, putting it before the Lord's-Supper. Let us proceed to our next question.

Q. How were the Antioch Christians confirmed?

A. By exhorting them to continue in the faith, and by reading to them the circular letter sent out to the Churches from the Synod at Jerusalem.

Q. Was there no imposition of hands?

A. Not one word about imposition of hands appears in the text.

Q. For what purpose were they confirmed?

A. To establish them in the faith of the Gospel, to comfort their hearts, to give them consolation, to fortify their minds against the heresy of the Judaizing teachers, and to give them full assurance of the truth of Christianity.

Q. How often were they confirmed?

A. It is stated that Paul and Barnabas continued in Antioch teaching and preaching the Word of the Lord, and it is a very reasonable inference that he exhorted the brethren and confirmed them every time he exhorted. But we shall see more about this in our further inquiry.

We may now briefly consider the declaration in the forty-first verse of this chapter—that the Apostle went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the Churches. Let us bear in mind that Paul and Barnabas were sent out by the same Synod which sent Judas and Silas. These evangelists bore a written letter. Paul and Barnabas were instructed to deliver the contents of the letter by mouth. They doubtless fulfilled their mission. Wherever they went, throughout Syria and Cilicia, they instructed the brethren orally in reference to the Jewish controversy, exhorted them, as did Judas and Silas, and confirmed them in the same way.

Let us push our historical inquiry a little further. Passing out of Cilicia, and proceeding in a north-west direction, the Apostle came to Derbe and Lystra, cities of Lycaonia, and there he found young Timothy, took him and circumcised him because of the Jews,

and enlisted him immediately in the service of the Master. On they went through Phrygia, and Galatia, and Mysia, stopping at the cities, preaching the Word, and delivering to the Churches the decrees to keep that were ordained of the Apostles and Elders at Jerusalem. *And so were the Churches confirmed (estereounto) in the faith, and increased in number daily.*

Our last citation from this valuable authority is found Acts xviii, 23. The beloved and devoted Apostle had made the tour of Asia Minor; passed down to Troas; bound from Troas, taken ship, passed up the Ægean Sea; preached at Philippi, the chief city of that province; suffered imprisonment, was released, and, departing, went on to Thessalonica, Berea, and Athens. Leaving Athens, he came to Corinth, and remained there a good while, preaching and baptizing. Sailing thence, he came to Syria. Landing afterward at Cæsarea, he went down to Antioch, and after he had spent some time there, he departed and went over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order, *confirming (episteeridzoon)* all the disciples.

It will be borne in mind that, some two or three years before, Paul and Timothy went over this very same region, preaching, and exhorting, and delivering the decrees, and by these means *confirming* the Churches. Now, it appears the Apostle traveled over the same country, preached, exhorted, and *confirmed* them again, for it is written that he went over the whole region in order, visiting all the Churches, and confirming *all* the disciples.

Our last question, then, is satisfactorily answered. How often were they confirmed? Over and over again. This closes, for the present, our examination of the book of Acts of Apostles. Shall we give some attention to the epistles?

CONFIRMATION IS TAUGHT IN THE EPISTLES.

We have already stated that, in the days of the Apostles, the Churches planted by inspired ministers became corrupted by errors, heresies, and schisms. It is necessary to have this fact before the mind of the reader, in order to understand the design of the Apostles in writing their epistles to the primitive Churches.

Let us notice these errors in numerical order, and then examine briefly some of the prominent epistles, with a view of prosecuting our inquiry respecting confirmation.

LEADING ERRORS OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCHES.

1. *Circumcision and conformity to the law of Moses are necessary for salvation.*
2. *Fews are the special favorites of Heaven.*
3. *Sectarianism: I am of Paul; I, of Apollos; I, of Christ.*
4. *There is no resurrection of the dead.*
5. *Christ will not come again.*
6. *Jesus is not the Christ, the Son of God.*

PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

The trouble in the Christian congregation at Rome grew out of the assumption, on the part of the Jewish members, that the Jews were the especial favorites of God. "We have Abraham for our father. We have the glory of the covenants, and the giving of the law. We have the oracles of God, and the ordinances. David is ours, and great David's greater Son, even the Christ, is ours. We are the real successors of patriarchs, prophets, kings, and priests. How can Gentiles participate fully with us in the grace of God?" The argument was too strong for the Gentile brethren, and the Spirit of God, superintending all things, and constantly acting as the great Paraclete, or Advocate, of the Messiah, according to the promise (John xvi, 7-14), directed the Apostle to indite this epistle to the congregation, as he had directed the minds of all the Apostles in proclaiming the Gospel to the world.

The Inspired Teacher announces to them that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation, *to the Few first, and also to the Greek*; that God is no respecter of persons, but that he will render to every man according to his deeds—eternal life to the obedient, eternal death to the disobedient—*to the Few first, and also to the Gentile*; that he is not a Jew which is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh, but he is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God.

To enforce the great idea of God's impartiality, he puts a number of questions in the third chapter. We notice those of the ninth verse: "What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin."

In the fourth and fifth chapters he develops the grand principle of justification by faith; shows that Abraham was justified not by works, but by faith; that the promise of God is sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all (all believers in Christ). This idea is repeated in the ninth chapter: "Neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all children; but in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, they which are the children of the flesh are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed."

In the tenth chapter he contrasts the righteousness of the law with the righteousness which is by faith; shows that Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth; that the Word of faith declares that "if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."

The nature of our subject does not require any thing like an extended analysis of this great epistle, or, indeed, any part of it. We merely design a very brief exhibition of the Apostle's leading design—to show the grace of God manifested through the Lord Jesus Christ; the extension of that grace to

"Every kindred, tribe, and tongue;"

the rich provisions of the Gospel; the unity of God's plan, embracing Jew and Gentile; the justice of the Almighty in justifying every one who believes in Jesus and obeys his commands, and the certainty of a future judgment.

After presenting his argument the Apostle presents his exhortation, commencing at the twelfth chapter and closing with the fifteenth. The last chapter is taken up chiefly in salutations, but he renews his exhortation at the close. We close by quoting verses 25 to 27: "Now to him that is of power to *confirm* you according to my Gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest, and by the Scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known unto all nations for the obedience of faith: to God, only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ forever. Amen."

Now, we ask, what was the Apostle's leading design in writing this letter? We answer, with all the light before us, to *confirm* the Roman Christians in the faith of the Gospel, by overthrowing and refuting the arguments of the carnal Jew. He enforces the argument by exhortation, and thus, as Judas and Silas at Antioch, and Paul himself throughout Syria and Cilicia, he administered *confirmation*.

PAUL'S EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS.

The congregation at Corinth was greatly demoralized by error in doctrine, heresy, sectarianism, and immoral practices. It was full of skepticism and idolatry. Like Israel of old, they loved idols, and they would go after them.

Paul devotes some four chapters of his first epistle to the correction of their sectarianism; shows that Christ is one and indivisible; begs them not to glory in man, and assures them that "all things are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's;" urges them not to go after false instructors, but to follow him as an inspired teacher. After reproving them for the toleration of certain evils—incest, litigation, idolatry, adultery, etc.—he proceeds to correct the evils into which they had fallen in eating the Lord's-Supper, and points out to them, doubtless as he had done before, orally, the time, place, and manner of attending to this institution. He then discusses the subject of spiritual gifts, and after that follows his chapter on charity. Then comes a chapter of instruction in reference to public worship; then his memorable and all-powerful argument on the resurrection. Some of them said there was no resurrection, and Paul shows that if there be no resurrection, then is Christ not risen; his preaching was vain, then faith was vain, all was vain—Christianity was a falsehood, and he was an impostor. Those who had fallen asleep in Christ would sleep forever. Yea, death is an eternal sleep, if the doctrine of the Sadducean Rationalists be true, and we Christians, of all men, are the most miserable.

"But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept. . . . We shall not sleep, brethren, but we shall be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. . . .

And thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast [be ye confirmed], immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord."

Thus did Paul confirm the Corinthians. An examination of the second epistle would lead to the same or a similar result. We quote a single passage from the first chapter of the second letter, adopting Bishop Quintard's translation: "Now he which *confirmeth* us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts."

We can not forbear the pleasure of giving the confirmatory exhortation, chapter xiii, 2: "Finally, brethren, farewell. Be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace, and the God of love and peace shall be with you."

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS

shows that the Churches of Galatia were removed from the Gospel of Christ to another Gospel by the influence of designing men. They were fast becoming Legalists. "Received ye the Spirit," says Paul, "by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith? Having begun in the Spirit, are ye made perfect by the flesh? . . . Ye are all the children of God by faith. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. . . . *Stand fast* [be confirmed] in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. . . . In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. And as many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God."

Thus were the Galatians confirmed by epistle. Paul had confirmed them once before (Acts xvi, 6) by delivering the letter of the synod of Jerusalem, and now he confirms them again by his own letter.

Omitting three of the epistles, we briefly notice, in the next place,

THE TWO EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS.

We have an account of the preaching of the Gospel at the city of Thessalonica, by Paul, in the seventeenth chapter of the Acts of Apos-

tles. Paul preached Christ. The Thessalonians heard, believed, and obeyed. They were doubtless baptized, and organized into a Christian congregation. Some time after this Paul wrote to them his first letter. He had heard that they were in great trouble, and had suffered much persecution. He had intended visiting them, but Satan hindered him. And when it became necessary for him to be left at Athens alone, he sent Timothy, the young evangelist, "to *confirm* them, and comfort them concerning the faith," (chapter iii, 2,) in order that no man should be moved by the afflictions which had come upon them. Now it does not appear that Timothy laid his hands upon them. He held no ceremonial confirmation, but as Paul sent him to "know their faith" and to administer consolation, he fulfilled his mission, and returned to the Apostle, reporting that they were faithful. "Now, when Timotheus came from you unto us, and brought us good tidings of your faith and charity, and that ye have good remembrance of us always," etc., we were comforted over you in all our affliction and distress by your faith." Here we have all the elements of a real Apostolic confirmation. Timothy, an evangelist, was the confirming minister. The Thessalonian Christians, who had been admitted for some time to the communion, were the persons confirmed. The confirmation consisted in establishing them in the faith, and there is no evidence whatever that Timothy's hands were imposed upon a single man. This occurred before the writing of the letter.

Again, Paul confirms them in the faith of the coming of Christ and the resurrection of the dead, by assuring them of these great facts (chapter iv, 13-17), and entreats them to comfort one another with these words. In the second epistle he corrects an error into which they had fallen respecting the early coming of Christ, and begs them to stand fast—be confirmed—and hold the tradition which they had been taught. Yea, further, he presents this language: "Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father, who hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts, and *confirm* you in every good word and work."

This closes our examination of the epistles. We proceed to notice the proof-texts of the advocates of ceremonial confirmation.

They usually present two cases recorded in Acts: first, the case

of the Samaritans, Acts, chapter viii, in which we have the imposition of the hands of Peter and John upon all who had been baptized by Philip; second, the case of the disciples at Ephesus, recorded Acts xix. In both these cases the result of the laying on of the Apostles' hands was *miraculous*, and there appears to have been some special reason why the "men and women" baptized at Samaria, and the twelve Ephesian disciples rebaptized by Paul, or by his direction, should have been made the recipients of the Holy Ghost, so that "they spake with tongues, and prophesied." Let us study these cases. The argument of the ceremonialist may be reduced to the syllogism,

1. Whatever the Apostles did to the newly-baptized converts at Samaria and Ephesus is necessary in all cases.

2. The Apostles laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost.

3. Therefore, imposition of hands is necessary in all cases.

This is a case of *Petitio Principii*. The question is begged. We deny the premises. In support of our denial, we appeal to the Scriptures:

1. On the day of Pentecost, Peter and his associates baptized three thousand penitent believers, *and they did not lay their hands on them*. The miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit was limited to the Apostles and their associate ministers. The three thousand did not speak with tongues.

2. At the Temple, on a subsequent day, Peter preached again. Many believed, and the number of the men was five thousand. No imposition of hands here.

3. The case of Philip and the eunuch. Who confirmed the eunuch by imposition of hands? Why did not some Apostle come to the eunuch, or the eunuch go to some Apostle, if ceremonial confirmation be an essential ordinance? *He went on his way rejoicing*—away off to his own country, without the hands of an Apostle being laid on his head. According to bishop Quintard's reasoning, the "Christian profession of that Ethiopian convert was not complete." Peter and John ought to have followed him into Ethiopia. It is quite possible he went there and preached Jesus to some of his people, but surely he had no right to do it if the ceremonialists be correct. He may have baptized some poor soul who desired to obey the Lord, but, alas! the baptism would be invalid, according to our Ritualists. He

had not been confirmed by Apostolic hands. Yea, further, he might have fallen in with a Christian congregation on his way home, a few hours, even, after his baptism. He could n't commune. Why? Because he had not been confirmed by holy hands!

4. The case of Saul, of Tarsus. Saul was baptized, without a doubt. Was he confirmed according to Episcopal rite? The unity of the system requires it. Who confirmed him? We insist upon an answer to this question, and in order to afford some help on the subject, we present the following facts: "When it pleased God," says the Apostle to the Galatians, "to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen, *immediately* I conferred not with flesh and blood, *neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were Apostles before me*, but I went into Arabia, [where there were no Apostles,] and returned again into Damascus. Then, *after three years*, I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days." If our Episcopal brethren can prove that during these fifteen days *Peter confirmed Paul*, we will give up the controversy. The *onus probandi* rests upon them. Surely, the imposing ceremony of confirming so important a character as the Apostle to the Gentiles ought not to be omitted from the Sacred History. We continue: "But other of the Apostles saw I none, save James, the Lord's brother." One question we respectfully submit. If Paul—who gave, on several occasions, a minute and circumstantial account of his conversion, baptism, and all, (as recorded in Acts,) and here, in this epistle, lays stress on his non-intercourse with the Apostles—had been confirmed, would he not have stated it?

5. The Gentiles at the house of Cornelius. Peter preached to them, and while he was preaching, the Holy Spirit fell on them, and they spoke with tongues. No hands were laid on them—or, if there were, it could not be styled confirmation by the "Churchmen," for they were baptized after the outpouring.

We need not multiply cases. The truth is, the Holy Spirit was granted to primitive Christians both in the ordinary moral and the extraordinary miraculous manner—the latter with or without imposition of hands—but *it is never styled confirmation. In all cases of confirmation recorded in Acts and in the epistles hands were never imposed, and in all cases of imposition of hands the sacred historian never speaks of confirmation.*

To return, then, to our inquiry. For what purpose did Peter and John lay hands on the Samaritans, and thereby impart to them the gift of the Holy Spirit? We answer, To exhibit to all interested the truth that God had indeed granted repentance and remission of sins to the Samaritans as well as to the Jews. When the Savior sent out the original twelve (Matthew x, 5) he laid a positive injunction upon them not even to enter any city of the Samaritans. That injunction was now removed, and he declared unto them that they should be witnesses for him both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in *Samaria*, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth. The Jews had no dealings with the Samaritans, and it was necessary, in order to remove prejudice from the minds of the former, that the latter should receive a token of God's favor. That token was conferred by Peter and John soon after their baptism. The evidence, then, was irresistible. God conferred the same gift upon the Samaritans which he did, on the day of Pentecost, upon the Apostles, and which was conferred likewise, subsequently, upon the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius, all for the purpose of showing, in the language of Peter, "that God is no respecter of persons, but that in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." The Samaritans could say to their Jewish brethren, "Forasmuch as God has given us the like gift, which he granted the Apostles on the day of Pentecost, we beseech you not to withstand God, but grant us your fellowship in Christ Jesus. For in Jesus Christ there is neither Jew nor Samaritan, for we are all one." For this purpose, then, and for this chiefly, if not exclusively, the hands of the Apostles were imposed upon the Samaritan converts.

But what shall we say of the case of the twelve Ephesian disciples (Acts xix, 1-6)? Very plainly, it was a demonstration of the invalidity of John's baptism after the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, and a token of approbation of Christian baptism. The Ephesian disciples knew nothing about the gift of the Holy Spirit. They had not received Christian baptism for the remission of sins, and now, to demonstrate that God would ratify the post-Pentecost baptism, he gave the seal of his approbation by the miraculous exhibition of the Holy Spirit.

The only remaining proof-text of the "Churchmen" on this subject is Hebrews vi, 1, 2. It is assumed that when the Apostle speaks of

the laying on of hands he has reference exclusively to the ceremony of confirmation. But we have before shown that whenever confirmation is spoken of in Acts, or in any of the epistles, "laying on of hands" is never mentioned, and when "laying on of hands" is spoken of, confirmation is never mentioned. The logic of the "Churchmen" on Hebrews vi, 1, 2, is, therefore, to be classed under the head of *non sequitur*.

If, now, we are asked, How came the name "confirmation" to be applied and appropriated as it has been for so long a period of time? we answer, It originated with the Fathers, who originated most of the errors that have been imposed upon the religious world. They were the poorest theologians that ever thought, wrote, or preached, and he who takes a "*Father*" for his guide, directly and flagrantly disobeys Christ (Matthew xxiii, 8, 9).

May we, in conclusion, address to all Christians

A WORD OF CONFIRMATION.

Beloved in the Lord, we have been called from darkness to light—from sin to holiness—from the service of Satan to the service of God. Let us continue patiently in well-doing, seeking for glory, honor, and immortality, and when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory.

II.—THE SPIRIT OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND CREEDS.

IN whatever field of thought the man of intellect may labor, he needs to know the spirit of the age in which he lives. Without this knowledge he may survey the ten thousand beauties of nature with surprise, and perhaps even with delight, but when he turns to the more practical concerns of daily life, the social problem is to him a dark and ominous mystery. All inanimate nature about him is bright and beautiful, but the tendency of the great world of humanity is a fearful enigma. Like the ancient Pharisees, he can behold the face of the sky, but can not discern the signs of the times. He shuts his eyes in hopeless despair, or adopts some fanciful theory of ultimate Utopian good, let the present actions of men be what they may. With such, consequences, contrary to every known law of causation, work out a remedy for every evil. Too great an anxiety to grasp at once the great results, or despair of comprehending the ultimate finale, is about equally unfortunate for understanding the spirit of the age and the signs of the times. But, the signs of the times are only to be learned from the spirit of the age. In some things we are still necessitated to use the synthetical method of reasoning. The smelting furnace, from large quantities of dross and foreign matter, yields only a few pounds of the precious metal. But the metal is in the ore, and fire must bring it out. So the signs of the times are in the spirit of the age, and without this much of *à priori* reasoning they could never be found.

The nineteenth century is eminently a period of progress. The characteristic unrest of society is something more than uneasiness. Its meaning is that we feel the attraction of some higher good, something better, more elevated and elevating than hitherto the world has ever enjoyed. The progress in the arts, the discoveries in science, the improvements in agriculture, and its implements, all, all attest that the world is in motion. These, however, are but the externals of things, which rise to the surface, and are known and read of all men. But there is something unseen, something working

constantly beneath all this mighty upheaval; and this indomitable energy is the spirit of investigation, and investigation is the spirit of the nineteenth century.

How much the new method, the Baconian system of reasoning, has contributed to our present progress, it is hardly possible to describe. So long as the world was led by a sect of philosophers whose greatest merit lay in the ingenuity with which they could press the facts of nature to sustain a theory of their own imagining, so long little progress was made in real knowledge; and when the "*Novum Organum*" swept away like gossamer the old systems of so-called science, many intelligent men, no doubt, felt profoundly discouraged, and exclaimed, "When shall return such luster to the coming years?" and, in their discouragement, were slow to avail themselves of the simplicity and truth of the new system. Some, no doubt, felt it a solemn duty to hold on to and repair the old system. A hive of bees, when their comb is broken, will turn all their energies to repairing damages; nor can they be induced to do any thing to increase their store until such repairs are effected. So, much time elapsed before the Baconian logic began to show its Samsonic power; it required, too, so much more patience to get a theory by the induction of one fact at a time, and that also carefully compared with every known test of truth, that we need not wonder if its obvious truth and simplicity were sadly disregarded by Lord Bacon's contemporaries. By his process, theoretic systems were necessarily of slow growth; but what was lost in magnificent hypotheses was gained in practical truth, and the reign of ornate ingenuity gradually yielded to that of patient investigation, and cold intellect took the palm from fiery imagination. So we respectfully hand over imagination to the domain of *Belles-Lettres*, but in Science, Art, and Agriculture the analytic philosophy is the last and best authority. But however much or little the "*Novum Organum*" has done for generations past, there can be no doubt but its grand triumph has been reserved for the present century. The Baconian theory opened the door of thought to the patient worker, and setting a low value upon a sanguine imagination, with which, very fortunately for the race, all men are not highly gifted, it brought the high and the low more evenly upon the plane of a common rationality.

It is no part of our plan to declare that Bacon's *Organum* is even

yet universally received. It is not so. Too many are even yet clinging to the old systems. But what we wish most emphatically to state is this, that all that makes the present age excel every one of its predecessors in practical sciences and useful arts, can be referred to the influence of inductive reasoning. When patient investigation is rewarded with practical demonstration, the spirit of inquiry is encouraged, and gains an impetus which the synthetic system could never impart. True, nature has implanted in man the disposition to inquire, but under the old systems labor in that direction was so fruitless that the instinct for full, original investigation was paralyzed and dwarfed; but the grand reward of applied intellect in the nineteenth century has given it an impulse without parallel in the world's history, so that it has become a characteristic of the age in which we live.

It may be truly objected that many of our modern investigations are latitudinarian, many of them on unprofitable questions, and a majority of them unsatisfactory. In such freedom of thought, among such fallible intellects as ours, such accidents must occur, but it is not wisdom in us to try to repress the spirit of the age, but rather to assist the praiseworthy efforts of a mighty aspiration to obtain more comprehensive views of every thing which courts purity of hearts, and woos elevation of intellect. Whatever is of peculiar interest to man, must endure the test of rigid investigation. Commercial schemes, tariffs, and agricultural hypotheses, are daily passing through the ordeal of the most intense scrutiny, and if we ask the reason of all this searching inquiry, the answer is, "These are questions in which we are deeply interested." But are we not equally interested in that science which reaches beyond time, and spans eternity? Shall we apply the logic of the *Novum Organum* to the knowledge of temporal things, because we know it to be a sure test, but in things of eternal importance shall we plod on in the old system of hypothesis before proof? Shall we not rather let the Bible be to religion what Nature is to science? Why should we not eliminate from religion every thing purely hypothetical, and fill the void thus temporarily created with analytic inductions of Scripture facts, commands, and promises? Shall we boast that "the Bible and Bible alone is the religion of Protestants," and then subject it to a system of interpretation which, for centuries, held natural science in a death-

like incubus? There is something in the analytic method so inviting to the patient thinker, something that beckons him so kindly forward to assured success, that the number of those who think for themselves is increasing every day, and to apply this method to the interpretation of Scripture, would be to throw open the flood-gates of inquiry, and inundate a territory over which we have for centuries heard a hoarse voice repeating, in solemn cadence, "*Procul! O, Procul, este profani!*"

But however solemn the warning, it is the spirit of the nineteenth century to regard it not. Even the cherished creeds of the most popular orthodoxy must stand before the judgment-seat of searching inquiry. But the spirit of every ecclesiastical creed* is a *caveat* to investigation. It says to each of its devotees, "So far must your inquiry extend, but no further. This must be the end of intellectual improvement on this subject."

The Roman Church deliberately curses every one who may deny the articles of her creed, and all Protestant creeds are permeated with something of the same spirit. To be sure, Protestants have read their Bible too well to be caught *cursing* their fellow-men. Hence, they say, let him who denies our creed "*be separated*" from us—a much milder form of words, with almost the same meaning. If the Almighty should pronounce such sentence upon him who rejects the Bible, it should be awfully feared, and not called in question. But when men like ourselves propose, on their own authority, propositions for us to accept on the pain of ecclesiastical curses, we can only look upon them as the quintessence of intolerance.

Human creeds, as terms of fellowship, or as means of preserving organic union, have been ably exposed by the labors of Mr. Campbell and others, so that little remains to be said in that direction. Their influence on the outside world has been shown to be evil, only evil, and that continually. But our present purpose is to develop their internal workings within the bodies over which they shed their balmiest influence. What, then, are the advantages of a human creed to a creed-bound Church? Their answer would doubtless be, "We have peace. We are not troubled with numberless controversies,

*The term *creed* is here used in its popular sense: A human summary of religious doctrine, which must be used as a test of denominational-fellowship. That it can be used in a sense entirely free from objection, we pretend not to deny.

like those who have no creed. If any one among us gets up a new doctrine, all we have to do is to bring him to our standard, and if his teaching does not correspond with our articles, our process is summary." So, then, a Church, blessed with a human creed, can detect a heretic without going to the Bible. When they hear something new and do not know whether to believe it or not, they can search the creed to see if those things be so. If the noble Bereans had had similar facilities when Paul preached to them, they would have had much less labor to perform; but it is very doubtful whether any of them would have believed. If human creeds lighten the labor of their followers in searching the Scriptures, they do them a positive injury; for we need labor in this very department.

To search the Scriptures is a solemn duty, and whatever controversy may arise to drive us to that delightful task, should be hailed as a blessing to *us*, even if the doctrine in question should be condemned as false, for it has given us a zest for searching the Scriptures. We have accomplished a search—we have triumphed over an error—our horizon is enlarged! We have learned much more than we were seeking for; we have gained much religious strength, and we have also learned something about *how* to investigate God's Word. But best of all, we have learned more intensely to love and venerate the Holy Book. Now all this legitimately and naturally grows out of making the Bible the sole arbiter in controversy. But the objector will say, "Do not all Protestants always make the Bible such arbiter?" When there is controversy between two denominations, the appeal is to the Bible, but when among themselves, it has to be settled by the creed. Hence it is plain the Bible is not their *only* standard. They have one of human origin, for their own use at home, and another of Divine origin, to use in controversy with their neighbors. But whether they pay themselves or their opponents the higher compliment, is left with the reader to decide.

A very intelligent Southern lady, when speaking of women's rights, remarked in our hearing, that in the South they were "not troubled with such silly controversies." The unspoken thought immediately occurred, the reason is obvious, there is too much stagnation. The cemetery is also exempt from such vexations, and for a similar reason. Yet there are many annoying and unprofitable controversies, from which the weary thinker would gladly escape,

though he would by no means prefer a sluggish inactivity to action, or sickness to robust health. The heavy-laden man of thought may need rest, but never needs indolence. Activity is not a synonym of life, but it is one of life's most peculiar *phenomena*. And without its appropriate activities, neither animal nor intellectual life could long exist. And just so far as a human creed represses the spirit of investigation—just so far as it makes any one contented without searching the Scriptures—just so far does it contribute to religious decay, moral inertia, and spiritual death.

But we are met here with another objection: "If controversy prevails in a Church, there is an end of peace; and peace we must have, or there is no union, and if no union, no Church! Hence, we must have a creed, or we can have no Church." The fallacy of this objection lies in the assumption that investigation and controversy are identical with, or inseparable concomitants of, angry feelings, quarreling, and alienations, etc. But fortunately for the truth, the spirit of inquiry is not one of anger or clamor. But so soon as the angry passions rise, and our hearts and tongues are tempted to strife, so soon are we disqualified to conduct any kind of investigation. None but children are excusable in mistaking anger for argumentation. But the Church is for the education and training of *men*, "even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil." But without exercise and practice, we can never learn to discern between good and evil doctrine. But if our senses are to be *exercised* to develop their powers, it is hardly right and proper for our ecclesiastical superiors to treat us as if we were children, and destined never to attain to majority. Why should a Christian of full age be told, like a child, what he ought to believe? Why should he be saved the labor of investigating and thinking for himself? Why should we fear he might quarrel with some one, if we intrust him with so much liberty? Are we dealing with men, or with children? And children will never become men, but men will become children, if restrained from the use of their own intellectual and moral powers. We may as well think of seeing with another man's eyes, or walking with another man's feet, as to talk of a *man's* doing *his own* thinking or believing when restricted to a set of words with the framing of which he had nothing to do, and to which he only gives his assent because he imagines its authors knew more than

himself. If such submission be made to God, it is reverential, proper, and elevating, but when made to man, it is servile and debasing. It is because the instincts of nature spurn these thralls that professed creedists so frequently attain to intellectual majority. And these noble exceptions to creedish imbecility are always to be found where the human creed sits light upon the conscience.

But here we are met with another objection: "What [any] one understands the Bible to teach, he believes, and in this sense of the word [it is] his creed." This is true in the sense here specified. What any one believes may be called his creed. But should the objector write out what he *now* believes the Bible teaches, and pledge himself that his faith shall always stand in *statu quo*—never advance, and never recede—no additional light shall ever be allowed to enhance his faith, or improve his understanding—such a one has really come around to a human authoritative creed, and to one, too, which will torpify his soul and hamper his energies equally with those of the most intolerant partisans. If "what any one believes is his creed," let such belief be always open to emendation, when compared with the Scriptures, and we will not object. We all think the Bible teaches something, and that something we all believe. But should that belief be shown to be a great mistake, we do not fly to what we think the Bible teaches to sustain ourselves, but to the Bible itself. The true believer does not feel himself committed to his *thoughts about the Bible's teaching*, but to the Divine testimony alone. Our faith in the Holy Scriptures may be as immovable as the mountains about Jerusalem, while our views of their teaching may undergo a radical revolution.

But if the above objection be valid against the Bible as a creed, every human creed is equally involved in the dire consequences of the same logic. Each believer of the *Westminster Confession* only believes what he thinks it teaches. So, according to the above objection, the *Westminster Confession* is not his creed, but his understanding of its teachings is such, to all intents and purposes! So of every creed. Hence there can be no creed in existence except our conceptions of those things which are thought to be creeds, but are not! For surely if our belief in our own understanding of the Bible be a bar to our making the Bible our only creed, the understanding of any written or printed formula must be subject to the same objection.

But enough for the character of this objection. It is not our understanding of the Scriptures against which we object—it is not even diversities of understanding against which we put in our *caveat*—but it is against making them unchangeable perpetuities.

What would we think of the intellect and candor of Newton, had he proposed that his disciples should never outgrow his *Principia* of natural science? His labors are constantly subject to careful investigation, and he intended them to be so; and if his theory of nature stands unshaken to-day, it is because of the impregnability of its truth, not for fear of the authority of his great name. And no lover of scientific truth but would rejoice if the new doctrine of Conservation of Forces should explode Newton's whole theory of gravitation, and no one would think such an event equivalent to a disruption of nature. On the contrary, every detection of error in philosophy would but intensify our appreciation of its truth and stability. In nature we trust God to be his own interpreter, and, however much men may injure themselves with a false philosophy, we have no fears for the energies of nature. Why can we not have equal faith in the Bible? Though, by false reasoning, men may overthrow themselves, they can not overthrow the Bible, else it would have been done long ago. We trust, in nature, that its truth will triumph over all the errors of philosophy. She needs no authoritative creed to restrain men from the investigation of all her laws. She has no fears that a more intimate knowledge of her works will destroy our reverence for her power.

But if an authoritative creed in philosophy, defining the metes and boundaries of human knowledge, be a check on intellectual progress—if such a restraint upon science would be characterized as an intolerable absurdity—can a reason be shown why it is not equally absurd in religion, and equally a bar to Biblical knowledge?

But this is not all, nor is it the worst influence in the precincts of their own dominion. They promote intolerance toward those of a different creed. Their faith in Christ and God may be unexceptionable, their lives may be exemplary for piety and devotion, yet, if they can not repeat the same human formula, they must not be recognized as Christians. They may be angels in intellect, Howards in philanthropy, and Elijahs in purity and zeal, yet, if not of the same party creed, they may be treated with cold respect, but must not be

embraced as Christian brethren. It frequently happens that wrong done reacts upon the wrong-doer. And so is it here. When sectaries turn the cold shoulder upon men better than themselves; when they push them aside; when they malign them, they are doing themselves the greater injury. The chilling breath of sectarian bigotry has not only benumbed their internal energies, but it closes up the avenues to ulterior communions, and, in a great measure, cuts off the opportunities of doing or receiving good.

Why is it that Christianity can not be brought into polite society as a subject of conversation? The superstitions of modern pagans and ancient mythology may be brought up with propriety and discussed, and why not Christianity? The reason is obvious. Each member of a creed-bound Church has pledged himself to learn no more in that direction than his creed, which, it is but courtesy to suppose, he already knows. Hence, for persons of different creeds to try to instruct one another contains the covert insult of inviting a man to violate his pledge; and for those of the same creed to attempt to give instruction implies the impertinence of insinuating that your brother does not understand what he has deliberately pledged himself to believe! In either case, hard feelings must be the inevitable result. Hence, the Lord Jesus, who is the Alpha and Omega of our eternal hopes, must be banished from polite society! The heart may swell with love for Christ, but no utterance must betray us as one of his followers; or some pert damsel might confront us, as one such did Peter, and say, "This fellow also is one of them." Under such circumstances, if we speak at all, it must not be from the abundance of the heart, but from the reprehensible habit of light talking.

The radical infidels of Boston, in their late convention, struck no harder blow against modern Christianity than when they alluded to this feature of polite society. And with what a triumphant air they paraded this rule of etiquette as indicating the decay and death of what they called an "*effete*," *worn-out* system of religion! And yet where lies the blame of this profane restriction, if not in the existence of human authoritative creeds? And this feature of the subject alone is so pregnant with evils that it ought to be sufficient indictment to drive them from the purlieu of Christian society. How many thousand opportunities of learning or imparting good lessons are daily lost by this strangely baritrary rule of etiquette—a rule,

too, only made necessary by the bigotry and intolerance of human creeds.

What is society for but the cultivation of our higher faculties? We meet our friends in the social circle at a neighbor's fire-side—or, perhaps, at our own—and, in converse sweet, we gain and impart much useful knowledge about the things of the present life; but of Christ and heaven, where our treasure and hearts are, we must say not a word! Themes connected with our material welfare and temporal existence may be widely discussed; but of that higher, holier, and eternal life which is hid of God in Christ we may not speak in the polite social circle, because the spirit of human creeds has decided religious social discussions improper! Because of these artificial restrictions upon religious investigations, the question of Christianity is not open to a free, generous, and gentlemanly inquiry, such as is conceded to every other branch of human knowledge.

We do not say this rule of etiquette should, at present, be rescinded. It can not be. It is a necessity of the present antichristian form of sectarian society. But take away human creeds, and the cause will be removed, and the effect will cease. This rule of etiquette, now so necessary, will go into desuetude and be forgotten so soon as the Bible shall be to Religion what Nature is to Science. When we shall have received the Bible as the undoubted Word of God; when we shall apply to its exposition those common-sense rules which have availed so much in the elucidation of nature, then shall these restrictions on the freedom of religious intercourse be rent away, and go into deserved and derisive oblivion!

RECAPITULATION.

I. We charge upon human ecclesiastical creeds that they are necessarily schismatic in their external tendency, tending to divide the real followers of Jesus.

II. Their internal influence is to cramp the vital energies of their devotees, and retard their intellectual and religious improvement.

III. They shear their Churches of their strength to defend the Bible against skepticism.

IV. Creed-makers treat men as if they were children, unable to investigate the Bible and do their own thinking.

V. Human creeds promote superstition, because they substitute human for Divine authority.

VI. They promote religious ignorance, because their tendency is to lay restrictions on religious social intercourse.

VII. They are entirely opposed to the progressive spirit of the nineteenth century.

VIII. They are, and will be, the war-clubs with which the enemies of our common religion are fighting, and will fight, against every type of Christianity.

With all these things in view, it becomes every follower of Christ to throw aside these weights, and stand up for the Bible alone; then shall we save the credit of that Holy Book in the coming conflict, and the effect of its truth shall be our eternal salvation. No creed but the Bible is worth contending for, and that alone is worth a thousand times more than all creeds. If we lose the Bible in contending for creeds, we shall lose all, and gain nothing; but if we lose all human creeds in contending for the Bible, we gain all, and lose nothing.

The crisis is upon us. A world, dying in sin, looks up to the lovers of simple Christianity for help and deliverance from the toils of modern skepticism. Romanism and Protestantism are powerless in the grasp of the gigantic foe. They are not able to save themselves, much less to rescue a world from sin and destruction. No human creed can deliver humanity from impending ruin. And he who would stand as champion for God and humanity must be clothed with the panoply of God, "with the armor of righteousness on the right hand and left." None but they who stand for the Bible alone can stand in "the day that cometh." Christians, then stand up for Christ, for that time is at hand! Great are our responsibilities, but without responsibility there is no honor. It is ours, fellow Christians, to be "the pillar and support of the truth!" O, blessed privilege! Distinguished honor! Transcendent glory! Thanks be to God, who shall give us the victory through Jesus Christ, our Lord!

III.—THE HUMAN SPIRIT AND THE ANIMAL SOUL—IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THEM A DIFFERENCE OF KIND OR OF DEGREE?

IT is a characteristic feature of our time, that principles are carried out to their full extent, premises to their legitimate consequences, be they what they may, and the writer is free to confess that he hails this as one of the good signs of the times. Want of decision, an irresolute halting between premises and inferences, we consider, under all circumstances, wrong in principle, and pernicious in its effects. What raises its head so high, in our days, as *Positive Philosophy*, *Naturalism*, *Materialism*—claiming not only the victory over all other systems and theories, but proclaiming itself as the absolute truth, by which alone humanity, in its riper age, must be guided, after religion has satisfied the wants of the race in its infancy, and philosophy and metaphysics have answered the same purpose while the human family was in its boyhood, sowing, as it were, its wild oats—is, in reality, old, very old, having been held in one form or another by philosophers or poets of the earliest periods of history. But in former ages these views were held with misgivings, and promulgated only with great reserve and hesitancy; at all events, they were not carried out practically. In our days, however, this state of things is totally changed; not only are the views in question loudly and unreservedly proclaimed, and that apparently with great sincerity, but they are also acted out with logical consistency. The existence of a personal God is positively denied, and with this denial all duties to him as non-existing cease, as a matter of course. The existence of the human soul as something different from the material body, and, in fact, the existence of any agent or force independent of matter, are denied or proclaimed as having been disproved beyond the possibility of a resuscitation. We thank the apostles of these doctrines for their frankness and boldness, for matters are now brought to a crisis. Not only does each party exactly know where it stands, but the position of these scientists is such that if a breach is made in

their citadel, repair is out of the question ; their stronghold is gone, and not fit for any further use.

The writer of these lines does, indeed, not belong to that class of theologians, who believe that religion or any article of faith can be demonstrated, but holds that religious faith, saving faith, is far more an object of the will than of the intellect ; yet what is to be believed, what claims our assent, must be possible—faith, dealing in objects that are supernatural indeed, but for this very reason the more real.

After these preliminary remarks, we approach our subject. Is the difference between man and beast a difference in quality or kind ? or is it one of degree merely ? If it is specific, the whole fabric of materialism falls to the ground to rise no more, for there is then a something, a power, a force, an agency independent of and superior to matter, which, with its inherent force, is claimed to be the only necessary and independent existence. Should it, however, appear, on the other hand, that this difference is not one in kind, but only a difference in degree, the writer confesses that to him the existence of a personal God, and especially of the human soul, would appear extremely problematical, to say the least. The writer is fully aware that even believers in the Bible have held views agreeing, in the main, with materialism on this point, having claimed for animals not only reasoning powers identical with those of man, but, consistently, also *will*, *moral feelings*, and an independent existence after death. We say "consistently," because it is the same power in man that *thinks* and *wills* ; hence where there is a thinking power there is power of volition, and *vice versa*—the *νοῦς* of the Bible—and the moral feelings, the conscience, are not an independent power or faculty, but the expression of the moral *status* or condition of the thinking and willing power.

The views of John Wesley on the subject in question are well known, and in order to prove what we have said of some other believers, we make the following quotation from a recent work, "The Reasoning Powers of Animals," by Watson. After stating, on pages 464 and 465, that such men as Abercrombie, Sir Benjamin Brodie, Bishop Watson, and Mr. Broderip have claimed every thing for the beast that man has, though in a lower degree, he quotes Rev. J. C. Wood as saying: "Much of the present heedlessness respecting

animals is caused by the popular idea that they have no soul, and when they die they entirely perish. Whence comes that most preposterous idea? Surely not from the only source where we might expect to learn about souls; not from the Bible, for there we distinctly read of the spirit of the sons of men, and immediately afterward of the spirit of the beast; the one aspiring, the other not so. And the necessary consequence of the spirit is a life after the death of the body. Let any one wait in a frequented thoroughfare for one short hour, and watch the sufferings of the poor brutes that pass by. There, unless he denies the Divine Providence, he will see clearly that unless these poor creatures were compensated in another world, there is no such attribute as justice."

We must say that this reasoning appears to us rather logical, and for this very reason we must reject the premise, because we can not admit the conclusion. To us it appears as something more than mockery, as a kind of blasphemy, to appeal to the Bible for proof of the individual existence of animals after death. Man's own self-conscious existence after death is uniformly represented in the New Testament as the effect of the work of Jesus Christ, life, blessedness flowing, in the case of believers, with necessity from their relation to the Savior, and the self-conscious existence of even the damned being the effect of the work of Christ. The idea of innate immortality or necessary existence of the human spirit, as spirit, is foreign to the New Testament. Man's whole earthly life is represented as a preparation for the other world, as a trial and probation, and it should be seriously maintained, that the same is the case with animals!

That the animal has a soul—*ψυχή*—*nephesh*—no philosopher or Bible student will deny for a moment; even *ruach* (breath) is ascribed to the animal, but *ruach* (spirit)—*πνεῦμα*, *νοῦς*—is predicated of man alone, and this is the principle to be made immortal by the Savior.

Of all materialistic writers L. Büchner, in his "*Kraft und Stoff*"—a little work of 274 16mo pages, that appeared in Germany first in 1856, and has gone through ten editions since, and has, moreover, been translated into all languages of the civilized world—appears to me the most consistent. Büchner maintains that there is no God, no immortality of the human soul, and being fully aware that his system can not stand without the identity (in substance) of the human and the

animal soul, he devotes to this subject a whole chapter, from which we make the following quotations :

"No specific difference, but only one in degree, between instinct and reason can be proved"—"the human body is a modified animal body—the human soul an animal soul raised to a higher power." "Man is in no respect absolutely superior to the animal, and his spiritual superiority is only relative ; not a single mental faculty is man's exclusive prerogative—his superiority consists exclusively in the greater strength of his faculties, and their advantageous combination." "Neither morphologically nor chemically is there any specific difference between the brains of man and the beast's—this difference is one only of degree." "Instinct, in the common acceptance of the term, does not exist, and the word is a mere pillow for lazy fellows who would like to avoid the difficult study of the animal soul, or one of those words by which men conceal their ignorance from themselves." "It is the climax of absurdity to deny to animals intellectual faculties—they feel, think, judge, and compare, choose and consult ; they have a memory, show love and hatred, and their senses are often finer than ours." "Who does not know, from Vogt's beautiful description, the wonderful institutions in force in the republic of bees ? Who has not read of the canine republics in the North American prairies ? Or of the scarcely credible practices of ants, which go out on plundering expeditions, bring home slaves which they train for service, and keep milk-cows in their extensive establishments ?" [I saw in the Antwerp Zoölogical Garden an ape which affected the beholder very painfully by making the impression that a human-like, reflecting, and feeling being was caged before him.] "The negro, both psychically and physically, reminds one very forcibly of the ape—the same readiness to imitate, the same cowardice—the negro being half tiger, half ape."

In the same chapter we are told that animals have a language, not only of signs and gestures, but also of words, capable of improvement and development, and toward the close we read :

"It is not only a flagrant injustice, but also sheer ignorance, to mistake the position of animal which they occupy over against man in the economy of nature. Whoever denies their spiritual and psychical powers, does not see farther in nature than his bodily eye reaches, and is altogether unqualified for passing a judgment on spiritual affairs."

This language has the merit of being plain, and can not be misunderstood, nor have we here the views of an individual merely, but those of a whole school, which has wide ramifications over every country in the civilized world—English, French, and German authorities sustaining every position taken by our author. In the premises these two schools agree that the difference between man and beast is only one in degree, but in their conclusions they go widely apart—one party claiming immortality for the beast, while the other denies it to man. Which of the two is in the right ? Which one are we

to follow? We can not adopt the conclusions of either, and, therefore, by necessity, reject the premises of both. That Mr. Büchner's positions call for no serious refutation, is self-evident; as the words said to have been spoken by Galileo before the Inquisition ("*E pur il mueve*") close his book, which words were not spoken on the occasion claimed, at least not in the hearing of any mortal, because they would have delivered Galileo up to the scaffold, so every body that has ever heard Frederick Douglass lecture, or has any knowledge of the colored people of the United States, will feel disposed to smile at what Büchner says of the close proximity of the negro to the ape, or at what he prattles of the wonderful republics of the prairie-dogs or marmots. But, for reasons stated before, the subject calls, nevertheless, for the most thorough examination, because, if it is disproved, the whole fabric of materialism tumbles to the ground. Moreover, the examination of this subject enables us to draw the dividing line between faith and science distinctly, so that science is freed from the fearful incubus of materialism which is, in spite of the loudest clamors to the contrary, the deadliest foe of true science.

At the outset of our examination we declare, that we hold the Bible ground, which is, that man consists of three parts, *body, soul,* and *spirit*; the animal has body and soul, and, therefore, the powers that are peculiar to the soul, but it lacks the spirit and, therefore, the powers of the spirit. What, now, are the powers of the soul in the sense taken here? We quote, in answer to this question, from Delitsch's Psychology (passim): "The soul—*nephesh*—is the reflection of the spirit of bodily beings. For this reason the Scripture speaks of souls of men and animals only, not of souls of plants. In the animal the soul is the efflux of the (created) vital spirit that pervades the universe, by the ancients very properly called *spiritus mundi*. The human soul is the efflux of the human spirit, which is the immediate creation of God, *the Spirit*. The human soul is, in itself, considered impersonal, the spirit being the principle of personality, and only when *soul* and *spirit* are meant by soul, as is often the case, personality is predicated of the soul. The powers of the spirit are the νοῦς, the λόγος, and the πνεῦμα. The νοῦς is the principle that thinks, wills, and feels; the λόγος is the product of the νοῦς, and the πνεῦμα (in this limited sense) is the laboratory of the Holy Ghost in the work of regeneration and conversion; that is, that element of the

human spirit which the Divine Spirit makes the basis of his operations (Ephesians iv, 23). The functions of the soul are, perception, conception, remembering, imagining, feeling, and desiring. These functions the animal soul also performs, but the personal spirit being absent, which greatly modifies the same functions of the human soul, they must necessarily differ considerably from the latter."

The next question is: Are these teachings of the Bible in agreement with reality?—are they founded in fact? The human brain differs both qualitatively and quantitatively from that of animals. As to quantity, "the weight of a man's brains in proportion to that of the body, averages about 1 to 27, that of the long-armed ape about 40, while that of the fox is 1 to 205, of the horse as 1 to 400, and that of the elephant as 1 to 500. ("Reasoning Powers of Animals," page 282.) As to quality, human brain has

80	parts of water,	7	parts of albumen,
4.53	" " white fatty matter,	0.70	" " red fatty matter,
1.12	" " orm,	1.50	" " phosphorus,
5.15	" " salts, etc.		

In maniacs the proportion of phosphorus is 3 to 4½ per cent., and in idiots 1 to 1½ per cent.

As to quantity of brain matter, some animals have more than man. The healthy human brain (of an adult) weighs about 50 ounces, while that of the elephant, whose gross weight is 10,000 pounds, weighs 20 pounds. A fox weighing 10 pounds has 4-5 ounce of brain, while the long-armed ape, of about 150 pounds, must have 3¼ pounds of brain; and if only one-half of the stories told of the fox are true, he has more sense and intelligence than all the monkey tribes put together. Quantitatively, then, we see that the brain has but little to do with the animal's intelligence. How is it qualitatively? Here we are told that the windings, furrows, etc., have a great deal to do with thought, especially that the deeper the furrows are the greater is the thinking power. But as even materialists—whose avowed object it is to prove that the human soul is nothing specifically distinct from matter, but the product of the vital power in man working upon the brain—admit that the constituent parts of the human and the animal brain are as yet too little known to warrant any conclusions, we can not yet apply here the *reductio ad absurdum*.

But, even if they were right in saying that, without phosphorus there is no thought; were they right in saying, in order to prove that there are no innate ideas, that many human tribes are in a beast-like state or condition, that they have no idea of God; were they right in these, and many other similar unproven assertions, still they would not even have touched the real question. Destroy the instrument, and the musician can no longer call forth a sound; but is, therefore, the music the sole work of the instrument? Or, if in the absence of the agencies required for the development of the vital principle in the grain, this principle remains inactive and undeveloped for thousands of years, does this prove the absence of the vital principle? Supply these agencies and the vital power will soon show itself. If, by the influence of adverse circumstances, some tribes are in a really beastly state, if they have no idea of God, no organic language, etc., all this proves nothing in favor of materialism. Let the adverse circumstances be removed, let these degraded beings be instructed, and if they learn to speak, if they develop ideas, if they learn to love God, etc., as has been invariably the case when these conditions have been complied with—if, on the contrary, all efforts of the kind are unavailing in the case of the most favorably circumstanced animals, *all materialistic talk amounts to absolutely nothing.*

We proceed now to give in detail some of the specific psychical differences between man and beast. In doing this we shall follow mainly, though independently, Frohschammer in his recent work, *Das Christenthum und die Naturwissenschaften.* Wien. 1868.

We ask, in the first place, what is the psychical or soulish life of the animal? Is it only instinct, or more—and, if more, wherein does it go beyond instinct? What is instinct? Whatever the animal *does without previous instruction, without experience*, being controlled by an irresistible power of his nature, *that we say it does from instinct.* That this instinct is, in many cases, a safer guide than human reason and reflection, is well known. The newly-hatched duckling runs away from its distressed foster-mother, the hen, and takes to the water; the young mouse shudders at the first sight of the cat; the young buzzard or ferret distinguishes, at the first sight, between a venomous and a harmless snake. In all these cases we have exhibitions of instinct. But not only when the individual animal acts by itself do we witness instances of instinct, but also when numbers of

them act in concert. So, for example, many animals appoint sentinels, in order to espy the approaching enemy. Troops of wild horses form a circle, with their heads turned inward, and attack the bold enemy with their hoofs, while horned cattle turn their horns against the intruder. The ducks in the polar sea know not only their enemies, but distinguish them from each other, and adapt their modes of defense to the different kinds. When the sea-eagle, which can not catch them in the air, makes his appearance, they take to their wings; when the falcon appears, which easily catches them in the air, but does not readily take to the water, they dive; but when the hawk pursues them, which catches them as readily on the wing as in the water, they crowd closely together, and, beating the water violently with their wings, they make and throw up so much spray that their adversary can not see them. Although young animals may but rarely, perhaps never, go through such evolutions by themselves, yet we can safely assert that they would adopt the same modes of defense and show, at the first effort, as much skill as they ever acquire. All this is instinct. But the animal gathers also experience, and acts based on experience go beyond instinct. The bird builds its nest from instinct, but if its nest is destroyed by rain or storm, it seeks another less exposed place; and herein we see more than mere instinct—we see deliberation, choice. Old animals are more afraid of men than young ones; those that have once been shot at are more afraid of the hunter than of the farmer. In all these instances we behold not only sensation, but also perception, memory, will, and reasoning, judging. But, notwithstanding all this, the gulf between man and beast is impassable. What constitutes it? This gulf is constituted, in our opinion, by the following exclusively human powers and faculties: 1. Language; 2. Man's religious nature, showing itself in faith and culture; 3. Aptitude for arts and sciences; 4. Historical self-consciousness; 5. The ethical nature—conscience.

We are, indeed, told by such men as Büchner, C. Vogt, and others, that animals have language, have the power of speech. But we must be pardoned for asking, What kind of speech is it which animals have? Animals emit sounds expressive of their affections, joy, fear, anger, etc.; but these varied sounds are *not* language, for language (*lógos*) is only there where something spiritual, ideas, thoughts, are expressed and communicated to others, not where mere sounds are

produced, merely expressive of bodily states or physico-psychical emotions. We would call this the language of interjections, which man shares with the beast. But why is the animal incapable of language proper? Is it owing to organic defects? In part, we have to say, yes; for, although some animals learn, by a painful process, to produce some human sounds, yet these sounds are harsh and very unpleasant, as those of the parrot. But this is not the real cause. This is *because the animal has nothing to say*. What is language? The Bible calls thinking inward speaking; speaking, outward thinking. Without thinking there is, consequently, no proper language even in man. Animals have no language, because they have no real thoughts, being altogether confined to their physico-psychical state or their momentary outward condition. (Radically different from this is the condition of man: he has not only a knowledge of his existence, like the animal, but also of his spiritual nature, and its duties and calling, whereby he can make himself independent of his material surroundings.) The power of thinking is, indeed, improved, but not created by the power of speech. A parrot can thus be taught to imitate words; but, being unable to think, he can never learn to speak, while the deaf-mute is now taught to speak, whereby his slumbering powers are awakened, and his religious nature is wonderfully developed. This is the case with the dullest Australian, but not with the gorilla. As the soul—both that of man and that of the animal—does not fall under the observation of our senses, we reason from cause to effect, and *vice versâ*, and hence infer, from the absence of language in the animal, the absence of a thinking soul.

As the animal has not the power of thinking, it has no self-consciousness proper, which is the basis and indispensable condition of all other mental acts, and of the whole historico-ethical, objective, spiritual life of man. The absence of a clear self-consciousness is proved by the absence of the power of speech. It is also proved by the absence of an historical consciousness. This want incapacitates the animal for all historical progress, for all psychical development, while man, by this very consciousness, goes, in the course of time, beyond his merely individual existence and the merely monotonous repetition of it, building up an ethical realm or spiritual domain in history, by which the further development of both the individual and the race becomes possible. There are, indeed, human tribes so com-

pletely brutalized that they know absolutely nothing of the past, and show no trace of an historical development whatever; but this is owing to the unfavorable circumstances in which they live, not to their nature, which can be developed, as missionary efforts abundantly prove; and with the beginning of this development their historical self-consciousness commences. But the animal, in the most favorable circumstances, in the most intimate intercourse with men of the most civilized nations, is virtually still what it was thousands of years ago, and what it always will be. The incapacity for historical consciousness is the necessary consequence of, and demonstrates at the same time, the absence of a real self-consciousness. The animal has, indeed, a feeling of its own existence, also a certain kind of self-feeling, but no real knowledge of its own existence. It has, moreover, a certain kind of self-feeling, but no real knowledge of its being—namely, of its inward being—from which the inward and outward actions proceed and are felt, but by which they are, at the same time, distinguished from itself. The animal can not distinguish between its body and its psychical nature, can not emancipate the former from the latter, being subject to the sensual, the material; and the true cause of this, undoubtedly, is because there is in the animal no inward reality that could be separated from the bodily structure which would make it self-conscious and independent. For this very reason the animal can not reflect upon itself, its existence and life, nor propose to itself any other work than its bodily preservation. The animal lives and moves in order to live, not in order to fulfill another calling, as that of ethical perfection. The animal is, indeed, used by man for certain purposes, for the performance of certain labors; but the animal is, in this case, passive; is compelled to perform what it performs, and, therefore, realizes by its labor nothing for itself beyond its kind. The free, ethical activity of man, the working for ethical perfection, is foreign to the animal; and from this we infer that there is in the animal no spiritual nature distinct from and independent of the bodily organization, but that the animal soul is identical with its outward life and activity.

For the same reason the animal can not have a free will, independent of natural propensities and compulsion, and has, consequently, no moral or ethical nature, has no conscience, is no subject for law, is incapable of moral action. From all this it appears plainly that man,

who has all the capacities named, and exercises them in distinction from the animal, possesses an inward spiritual, independent being, which can, by thinking, as it were, separate itself from the organic life in order to aspire after development and perfection, according to intellectual and ethical laws, independently of, and even in opposition to, the bodily organization.

It is true, some animals expose their lives for their young ones or their masters, but they do not do this for an intellectual or ethical purpose. They do it, not in order to realize an ideal end, but from a physico-psychical excitement, from affection, and by no means with a clear self-consciousness, or with the intention to meet death.

Again, man is capable of a religious faith and cult, while in the animal there is no trace of a religious nature. We are, indeed, told by materialistic philosophers that there is no such a thing as innate ideas, hence no innate God-consciousness; on the contrary, that the large majority of mankind has always lived, and is still living, without any faith in God; that Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans are the only monotheists, and that this belief in God is a human invention, which one teaches another. Now, if we should admit all this, for argument's sake, materialists would not gain any thing by it, *for man is capable of a belief in God*, in the supernatural, in the invisible, no matter what the origin of this belief is, which the animal neither is nor can be made to be. However slow the process may be, however great the difficulties to be overcome may be, human beings in the lowest stage of savageness can be converted, by missionary efforts, to Christianity, and their religious faith has borne, in many instances, the best fruits. To say that such a thing is not possible with the animal, is to say something that every body knows, even materialistic philosophers, and yet they prattle of identity of man and beast. But we do not admit these claims of materialists. Wherever we meet with human beings in whom the specifically human is but in the least developed, (if not at all developed, as in the case of the idiot, the innate capacity does not show itself,) we find that they have some religious notions and practices. That this does not include a knowledge of the true God is self-evident, but the phenomena of nature, whether they be beneficial or otherwise, are ascribed by them to higher, invisible powers, which they fear and try to propitiate. Those nations and religionists—be they Buddhists, Fetichists,

or by whatever name they may be called—that are said to be atheistic are not Atheists, are not without a God-consciousness. They believe in and worship invisible powers, to which they ascribe an influence on human affairs. They have, therefore, the religious nature claimed for man as a specific attribute, the innate God-consciousness, which can be improved, developed, and cultivated, while in the whole range of animal life not even a trace of it is found, nor can instruction, example, training make the least impression in this direction. (It has, indeed, been said that there is in some animals something akin to religious faith—at least, something like fear of the supernatural—since they show fear by night and in the dark, from which it is inferred that they have some idea of the invisible or supernatural. But the fact is, animals—dogs, horses, etc.—show fear only then and there, when and where they apprehend danger for their bodily organization. This fear they exhibit by day as well as by night. They fear only physical effects and phenomena, not psychical conceptions, as man does. The gulf between the two is impassable.)

As the God-consciousness or innate idea of the Divine constitutes one of the specific differences between man and the brute, between the animal soul and the human soul, so also the kindred ideas of the true, the good, the beautiful, which mainly constitute and ennoble man's higher nature, while they are so entirely foreign to the animal that it can never be taught to appreciate them. The real cause of this difference is the absence in the animal of that inward, self-conscious spirituality, which forms in man the independent substratum of those ideal potencies or ideas. For this reason it is that animals are not capable of an education in this ideal point of view, for they lack both such original ideas, and the starting-points to which efforts of the kind would have to be directed in order to call forth the first psychical acts of this kind. For as every kind of cognition is based upon ultimate, immediate acts, whence it is homogeneously developed, so also in this ideal point of view. The animal lacks the homogeneous potencies for such primary immediate acts which must meet impressions from without in reciprocal action. As there is in the animal no starting-point, there is no development. Animals have no ideal, spiritual nature; that is, they have no such inner, spiritual nature, in which the ideal could be received into self-consciousness, and the ethical element could maintain itself.

Objectively considered, the animal has, indeed, an ideal principle realized in its nature ; namely, in its whole inward and outward organization, in the form of life and the preservation of it, from which ideal principle all its actions proceed. This is especially the case with sensation, which is in reality nothing else than the act by which the animal becomes cognizant of what ought to be or not with reference to its physico-psychical condition, and by which the animal is determined in all its movements. But beyond the rationale, the teleological, to the truly ideal, the animal does not advance, neither in its movements nor in its consciousness ; the animal can not, as man can, construct, in its consciousness, a realm of the ideal, whose center is the idea of God, or the absolute idea of reason.

The noblest productions of the human mind are the arts and sciences ; the intellect and imagination are the real factors. The fact that animals have never produced a work of art, and much less a science, or have developed any theory, however crude and imperfect, shows plainly that they are destitute of the necessary faculties. There are, indeed, those who concede to man only a relative superiority in this respect. But a close examination shows that the mental operations of the animal are of only an inferior character, beyond which it can not go. This kind of mental operation in the animal is conditioned by, and co-extensive with, its experience. The judgments of animals are empirical judgments ; that is, they are confined to sensual, outward objects, and are invariably individual, that is, concrete conclusions, whose subject and predicate are not general ideas, but concrete objects, or individual quantities of them that can be united with each other. Animals can not form general abstract ideas, nor general principles, by which to judge and act. Could they do this, they would be more or less capable of pure theory ; they could create mathematics, logic, ontology. But since they can not do this, it follows that they are really incapable of inner abstractions that could enable them to elaborate their experience into a mental possession, and construct thereupon a system. This incapacity proves, also, that animal intelligence differs from human intelligence in quality ; that is, is not an independent faculty, but only a power, which is not only in its operations in the psychical function itself circumscribed by the bodily organization—which is the case also with the human intellect—but whose very operations are confined to the sensual, the

organic, while the human mind is able to rise above the sensual, and to create for itself, with a certain degree of freedom and independence, a realm of ideas. Animals know and select, for example, the right kind of food for themselves, but certainly not from a knowledge of the properties of the plant, etc., but from instinct, which teaches them, without any previous experience, to reject the unwholesome and to eat the wholesome.

As animals have no self-consciousness, and, consequently, no really mental possession of their psychical being, so as to distinguish between it and their bodily organization, they can not appropriate any thing foreign, mentally, in order to turn it theoretically to account through an independent process of reasoning, as is done by man. For this very reason the judgments of animals are empirical, turning on individual objects, and are based on experience. Man, on the other hand, at least the cultivated man, does not need for his judgments a mediation through concretes, at least not always, but only signs or words as ideal equivalents for the objects themselves. (The reasoning of animals is, as it were, only an accident of perception, and of the occurrence of the thing perceived, hence necessarily confined to them.) The reasoning of animals is, consequently, an act of nature, the animal soul going in its reasoning not beyond that function which constitutes its vital principle; that is, it confines its operations to sensual objects. In man, the empirical is only the condition, not the necessary cause of thinking, while in the animal the psychical is, indeed, the primary condition and the active factor, but in such a manner that the physical is the leading and determining element.

Being thus circumscribed and confined to the sensual, animals do not plan or manufacture weapons of defense, while man, even in the lowest stage of savage life, prepares for his use some weapons, constructs huts, etc., against the inclemency of the weather, carefully keeps and makes fire artificially, while the orang-outang and the whole tribe of monkeys take, indeed, great delight in standing around a burning tree struck by lightning; but to no monkey has ever occurred the idea of keeping up the fire by putting wood on, etc. Animals follow invariably the impulse of the moment, being determined solely by the phenomenal, the concrete, not by general principles or maxims, for when they build nests for themselves, or prepare lairs, or lay in stores for winter, they act from instinct, not from deliberation.

Neither instruction nor experience is needed to guide them. Hence some facts would indeed seem to justify or to compel the conclusions, that some animals act according to some devised plan and method, when they, for example, use cunning or dissimulation in order to catch their prey, or when a pair of sharks does not tolerate another pair within a certain district, or when bees kill all the queens of a hive except one; but all these phenomena can be explained without assuming principles. (A combination, however, of instinct, experience, and affection, is sufficient to account for all this. Animals have no idea of what is ridiculous, witty, etc., because they pass only empirical judgments, and have, therefore, no standard by which to test the real, and, surveying with one effort of the mind several relations at once, to pronounce upon its absurdity, impropriety, or deep truth. For the animal there exists nothing but empirical reality—no truth in the sense of ideality or perfection; for these reasons animals are incapable not only of any religious faith, but also of any philosophical cognition, although they are not wholly destitute of the beginnings of empirical knowledge. Being incapable of forming general ideas, the animal soul is unable to draw conclusions from general premises.)

In the last place, art is peculiar to man. The animal has a real, independent, and active imagination; this, however, is only reproductive, uncreative, for which reason the animal can not represent its sensations and perceptions to the senses as truths or ideas, can not create a work of art, or rather, from the fact that they do not create works of art, we infer that they lack the qualifications for it. (The number of these specific differences between man and beast might be greatly increased, but enough has been said to demonstrate the fact that this difference is one of kind, and not merely one of degree; and the human spirit being independent of, and superior to, matter, it can not be the production of matter under any form or shape; not being eternal or self-existent, it must be the creation of a higher Spirit, God, of whom materialism knows nothing and can not know any thing. As every solemn advice given to it would be like throwing pearls before swine, we conclude with the indignant advice by Zeuxis to a meddling shoe-maker: "*Sutor ne ultra crepidam.*")

IV.—SYDNEY SMITH.

SYDNEY SMITH was a great man, but not signally great; eminent, but not pre-eminent; a philosopher, but not a leading philosopher; a man of strong mind, of fine culture, of sound common sense, courageous, self-poised, independent, and, withal, possessed of good principles and a good heart. His qualifications were such as placed him in the front rank, without making him the foremost in that rank. Others were courageous, truthful, sensible, cultivated. In one or another department of mental activity many equaled, a few excelled him. Hence it came to pass that Fame, who has little respect for the commonplace and ordinary—albeit very excellent things in themselves—and who never blows her trumpet in honor of plain good sense and homely every-day virtue, in order to distinguish Sydney Smith, seized upon that which was extraordinary in him—his inexhaustible store of wit and humor. Consequently he is now remembered chiefly as a “fellow of infinite jest,” and, although a whole generation has come and gone since he discharged those “flashes of merriment that were wont to set the table in a roar,” they are bright before us still. His contemporaries, no doubt, especially his intimate associates, looked upon his “most excellent fancy” as being but the sparkle on the surface of a really deep and serious nature—but the ornament of more sterling qualities. The versatility and power of his intellect, the virtues of his life, the manliness of his moral courage, the kindly sympathies of his heart, were recognized and appreciated by them as they can not be by us. These are not forgotten, certainly, but their impression upon the public mind is gradually growing fainter. Already the name of Sydney Smith is suggestive mainly of wit and humor. Before long it will probably suggest only these.

Some similar fate is doubtless in store for many another worshiper of the dainty divinity. She will hand him down to posterity—always supposing that she will do it at all—not for what is most excellent, but for what is most peculiar in him. It may be some squint of the mental eye, or some turn of the mental nose, or some eccentric jerk

in the mental gait, or it may be some still more curious or anomalous differentia, but, at any rate, it will be something strange in kind or uncommon in degree.

Well, after all, it is comfortable to feel that in the elegant Court Circle in which you and I move, my good reader—I am proud to say it—we are dressed, not, perhaps, equal to the very best, but as well as the common run of lords and ladies. Our jewels are genuine, and I am afraid that is more than every one could say. Our Truth and Honesty, our Temperance and Charity, should be esteemed valuable in any company, and *we* hold them, as you very well know, above all price. But let us be reasonable. When diamonds are flashing all around us, it is only the unusually bright or the uncommonly large that can be mentioned in the Court Gazette.

Sydney Smith was distinguished for wit, but this was by no means his only distinction. In many respects he was a singular man, and, taken all in all, a strange contradiction. The elements were curiously mixed in him. Physically, he was a veritable John Bull; intellectually, he mingled the solidity of the English with the lightness and playfulness of the French, being ponderous in argument, but humorous in style. He was a good hater, and a warm lover; fond of laughing, but often crying; a sort of cross between politics and religion, gravity and lightness, tenderness and sarcasm, wisdom and folly, orthodoxy and heresy; and, of course, with so many excellent qualifications for the profession, he was a preacher by predestination, though a lawyer by preference, and a doctor by practice.

The very contrarieties of such a character make it unique and interesting; and, in spite of them all, I have no doubt that the great current of Smith's life, guided, as it was, by predominating good sense and good principle, flowed ever strong and deep in one fixed direction. His reputation has suffered, however, from the fact that the surface of this current was so rippled by the freaks of his exuberant fancy, and sparkled so brightly and so constantly with the scintillations of his wit, as to divert the mind from observing its breadth, and depth, and tendency. Men have judged him by what was only fragmentary and exceptional in his life. They have viewed a chip whirling near the shore, and have inferred, from its motion, the main direction of the stream. Hence the contradictory lights and shades in which, from time to time, he has been, by one or another,

represented. For example, Dr. Doggett, in a rejoinder to Smith's review of Methodism, takes occasion to say :

"Sydney Smith, whose recent exit has left religion so little to regret, was one of those characters, the strange medley of whose elements could have produced nothing but the grotesque, and yet whose combination was such as necessarily to have made him prominent. In his constitution was a curious compound of a love of civil liberty and of religious intolerance; of the politician and of the clergyman; of sanctity and of worldliness; of the gentleman and of the wag; of judgment and of wit. He was a zealous Whig and a bigoted Churchman, vindicating the freedom of opinion by law, and crushing it by his pen; a supporter of ancient usage, and an assailant of private right; the originator of the Edinburgh Review, and the author of Peter Plymley's Letters; a metaphysician and a pamphleteer. As his character was a mixture of incongruities, so his life was a record of mistake, misfortune, and disappointment."

The language of Gilfillan is scarcely more complimentary. He says:

"There was one radical evil about Smith. He had mistaken his profession. He was intended for a barrister, or a literary man, or a member of Parliament, or some occupation into which he could have flung his whole soul and strength. As it was, but half his heart was in a profession which, of all others, would require the whole. He became, consequently, a rather awkward medley of buffoon, politician, preacher, litterateur, divine, and diner-out. Let us grant, however, that the ordeal was severe, and that, if very few have weathered it better, many more have ignominiously broken down. No one coincides more fully than we do with Coleridge in thinking that every literary man should have a profession; but, in the name of common sense, let it be one fitted for him, and for which he is fitted; one suited to his tastes, as well as to his talents; to his habits, as well as to his powers; to his heart, as well as to his head."

Per contra, Daniel Webster, whom Smith described as "a steam-engine in trousers," said he could never speak of him but "with gratitude, respect, and attachment." Samuel Rogers blesses his "power of turning every thing into sunshine and joy." Horner, associating him with Lord Webb Seymour, says: "I can not but learn candor, liberality, and a thirst for accurate opinions and general information from men who possess in so remarkable a degree these valuable dispositions." Macaulay admired him "as a great reasoner, and the greatest master of ridicule that has appeared among us since Swift." "You have been laughing at me constantly," said Lord Dudley to him, "for the last seven years, and yet in all that time you have never said a single thing to me I wished unsaid." All these, with Dickens, M'Intosh, Jeffrey, Edward Everett, and

numerous others, who knew him well, would doubtless agree with his biographer in saying, that his "life-time was passed in kindness, charity, truthfulness, and honor;" that "if his wit and humor sometimes appeared in excess, he was all the while pursuing a serious, noble, useful career;" in a word, that he belonged to that class of men who "enlarge the freedom of life, add to its faculties as well as its enjoyments, clear the intellectual, and warm the moral atmosphere."

Thus much, at least, we may conclude, from all the testimony, that a man who inspired so much of love and of hate, of admiration and of dread, could have been no ordinary, commonplace character.

The boyhood of Sydney Smith was passed in one of those celebrated boarding-schools which Dickens has immortalized in the picture of Dotheboys Hall; institutions which were founded on the then recognized principles of physiology and metaphysics—with some reference, also, to the science of political economy—namely, that the enlargement of the brain is in exact proportion to the contraction of the stomach, and that the road to learning is made easy by paving it with birch and ferule. We have learned, or think we have, that boys can be coaxed into labor and self-denial. We have substituted "moral suasion" for the rod, and beefsteak and pie for treacle and brimstone. It remains to be seen, however, whether the system will increase the number of good scholars. It is truly amazing what multitudes of boys our British ancestors actually flogged into learning, and starved into greatness. This was a summary process; doubtless it was often wretchedly abused, but it succeeded. Most boys, even now, would agree with Dean Swift in saying, that "labor is pain, and that none of his family had ever liked pain, from his great grandmother downward." Under the old *regime*, however, it was simply a question which they liked less, the pain of flogging or the pain of labor, and in consequence the labor was generally preferred, and thorough, accurate, comprehensive scholarship was the result. But Sydney Smith, I am bound to admit, did not like the alternative, and later in life he wielded his able and trenchant pen in opposition to it.

On leaving Oxford, where he was graduated in 1792, his own inclination, as we have previously intimated, was for the bar—a profession for which he seems to have had a natural aptitude, and in which he would, doubtless, have risen to the greatest eminence. But

his father had predestined him to the Church, and to the Church he went. Such a proceeding grates harshly upon our American sense of propriety—unaccustomed, as we are, in our daily life and experience, to an establishment with its tempting “loaves and fishes.” When we see a man deliberately assigning his son to the ministry as a profession, not on the ground of any supposed fitness for it, or inclination toward it, but solely and avowedly because it is the cheapest and best way of giving him a *start* in the world, we are constrained to think of the old text—“Not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind.”

Sydney Smith “started” very slowly. He was installed as curate over a parochial domain, limited to a handful of cottagers and farmers, where for two years he preached learned discourses to ignorant and staring boors, cracked jokes with Betty and Bridget during the week, and dined with Squire Beach on Sunday. At length, engaged as tutor and traveling companion to the Squire’s eldest son, he went to Edinburgh, where, for two years, he kept up a bachelor’s establishment, in spite of all sorts of domestic difficulties, among others, the susceptibility of his house-maid, which, he says, he finally conquered, and kept her in his service, “safe from the attacks of seven sweethearts.”

About this time he married Miss Pybus, of London; and sometime afterward, as the *Edinburgh Review*, which, in connection with Jeffrey and others, he had started, and of which he was editor, did not promise a fortune to its contributors, he consulted with his wife, as every prudent and sensible man will do, and, at her suggestion, resolved to take his talents to London. Here, with an increasing family, he entered manfully into the struggle for bread and fame, on a salary of fifty pounds a year, as preacher in a foundling hospital. This pittance was increased by some meager compensation for morning preaching in certain chapels, which his genius and talents soon filled with intelligent hearers. He was, in fact, a “popular preacher,” and, if he had been a dissenter, he would doubtless have taken rank immediately among the foremost of that class. Certainly, he was not a Whitefield nor a Spurgeon. His eloquence was not of the tornado type, rushing over pride, and passion, and prejudice with irresistible force, and confounding and crushing even where it might not convince. Still, he was popular. The strength of his mind, the

freedom of his thoughts, the originality of his style, the novelty of his illustrations, and the felicity of his diction, combined with a graceful and impressive delivery, would have made him popular with almost any audience. But he was connected with the Establishment, and consequently his advancement must necessarily depend, not upon his capacities for usefulness, but upon his politics; not upon the wants and wishes of the people, but upon patronage and favor; and so, being a Whig, and the Tories being in power, he continued to delight his little chapel audiences, and to draw his fifty pounds a year.

He struggled on thus for some time, very popular and very poor, keeping his place in a society in which he declared poverty was infamous; going to grand parties "with no equipage but his umbrella;" laughing at every thing, and amusing every body, from a lackey to a lord, until, finally, his good fortune blessed him with a slice of Church patronage—a "living" in Yorkshire. Smith went to thank Erskine for the appointment: "O, do n't thank *me*, Mr. Smith," said he; "I gave you the living because Lady Holland insisted on my doing so; and if she had desired me to give it to the devil, *he* must have had it." He spent twenty years in this living; made himself poor, for a large part of the time, by the building of one of the ugliest but most comfortable of houses; turned school-master to educate his son; turned farmer because he could not rent his land; was not able to afford a man-servant, "so," says he, "I caught up a little garden-girl, made like a mile-stone, christened her Bunch, put a napkin in her hand, and made her my butler." It is questionable which predominates in the following, the good humor or the good sense. Describing his life and circumstances at this time, he says:

"At last it was suggested that a carriage was much wanted in the establishment. After diligent search, I discovered, in the back settlements of a York coach-maker, an ancient, green chariot, supposed to have been the earliest invention of the kind. I brought it home in triumph to my admiring family. Being somewhat dilapidated the village tailor lined it, the village blacksmith repaired it, nay, (but for Mrs. Sydney's earnest entreaties,) we believe the village painter would have exercised his genius upon the exterior; it escaped this danger, however, and the result was wonderful. Each year added to its charms; it grew younger and younger; a new wheel, a new

spring; I christened it the *Immortal*; it was known all over the neighborhood; the village boys cheered it, and the village dogs barked at it; but '*Faber meae fortunae*' was my motto, and we had no false shame."

The remaining incidents of his life may be comprehended in few words. In 1828 he was promoted to the prebendal stall at Bristol, with a living and a charming residence called Combe Florey. A year later he was made canon residentiary of St. Paul's, still retaining the "parsonic parsonage" of Combe Florey. Thus he spent the remainder of his life in fame and in opulence, "dining," as he says, "with the rich in London, and physicking the poor in the country; passing from the sauces of Dives to the sores of Lazarus."

These last years of his life, though blessed with comfort and luxury, were not wasted in idleness. With pen and tongue he was constantly wielding the influence which rich culture, thorough discipline, and long experience made easy to him—performing the duties of his canonical office in the winter, and those of his country rectorship in the summer; while by pamphlets and other publications he ceased not to oppose intolerance, to defend what he believed to be the rights of his order, and to battle for the poor, the oppressed, and the out-cast, until the 22d of February, 1845, when he was summoned to his account.

"De mortuis nil nisi bonum atque verum."

As a writer, Smith's style is characterized by great purity and perfect transparency. He understood the English language, and he used it. What he wished to say he said pointedly, directly, forcibly, and plainly. His meaning is never left doubtful or obscure even for a moment. So complete is each paragraph in itself, so happily expressed, and so surprisingly and yet so aptly illustrated, that one may dip into his essays either in the beginning, the middle, or the end, and not only understand, but be interested in, what he reads. Take the following rejoinder to Copleston, for example:

"The observations of this writer are, like children's cradles—familiar to old women—sometimes empty, sometimes full of noisy imbecility, and often lulling to sleep. . . . One who passes for a great man in a little place, generally makes himself very ridiculous when he ventures out of it. Nothing can exceed the pomp and trash of this gentleman's observations; they can only proceed from the habit of living with third-rate persons, from possessing the right of compelling boys to

listen to him, and from making a very cruel use of this privilege. More equal company could never have made him an able man, but they would soon have persuaded him to hold his tongue. That there is something in this gentleman, we do not deny; but he does not appear to us to have the slightest conception how very little that something is, nor in what his moderate talents consist. He is evidently intended for a plain, plodding, every-day personage—to do no foolish things, and to say no wise ones—to walk in the cart-harness that is prepared for him, and to step into every commonplace notion that prevails in the times in which he happens to exist. If he would hold his tongue, and carefully avoid all opportunities of making a display, he is just the description of person to enjoy a very great reputation among those whose good opinion is not worth having. Unfortunately he must pretend to liberality, to wit, to eloquence, and to fine writing. He must show his brother tutors that he is not afraid of Edinburgh Reviewers. If he returns rolled in the mud, broken-headed, and bellowing with pain, who has he but himself to blame? He who has seen a barn-door fowl flying—and only he—can form some conception of this tutor's eloquence. With his neck and hinder parts brought into line—with loud screams, and all the agony of feathered fatness—the ponderous little glutton flaps himself up into the air, and, soaring four feet above the level of our earth, falls dull and breathless on his native dunghill."

Let us say nothing of the *animus* of this, but allowing that Smith was correct in his estimate, it is difficult to see how pretentious imbecility and pedantry could have been more thoroughly exposed.

The following is not quite so caustic—at least in our opinion, whatever Mr. John Styles might have thought of it:

"We are a good deal amused, indeed, with the extreme disrelish which Mr. John Styles exhibits to the humor and pleasantry with which he admits the Methodists to have been attacked; but Mr. John Styles should remember, that it is not the practice with destroyers of vermin to allow the little victims a *veto* upon the weapons used against them. If this were otherwise we should have one set of vermin banishing small-tooth combs; another protesting against mouse-traps; a third prohibiting the finger and thumb; a fourth exclaiming against the intolerable infamy of using soap and water. It is impossible, however, to listen to such pleas. They must all be caught, killed, and cracked, in the manner and by the instruments which are found most efficacious to their destruction; and the more they cry out, the greater plainly is the skill used against them. We are convinced that a little laughter will do them more harm than all the arguments in the world. Such men as the author before us can not understand when they are out-argued, but he has given us a specimen from his irritability, that he fully comprehends when he has become the object of universal contempt and derision. We agree with him that ridicule is not exactly the weapon to be used in matters of religion, but the use of it is excusable, when there is no other which can make fools tremble."

We fear our Methodist brethren never forgave Sydney for his attack on them, and that, like Dr. Doggett, they think his death left

religion very little to regret. It may comfort them to know that his own Church was not spared by him, when it laid itself liable to attack, and that his own brother ministers were sometimes made to feel the point of his ridicule. The following specimen is, in our opinion, more strictly *Smithianic* than either of those already given. It is taken from a review of a discourse by Dr. Sangford, of the Royal Humane Society :

"An accident which happened to the gentleman engaged in reviewing this sermon proves, in the most striking manner, the importance of this charity for restoring to life persons in whom the vital power is suspended. He was discovered with Dr. Sangford's discourse lying open before him, in a state of the most profound sleep, from which he could not by any means be awakened for a great length of time. By attending, however, to the rules prescribed by the Humane Society, flinging in the smoke of tobacco, applying hot flannels, and carefully removing the discourse itself to a great distance, the critic was restored to his disconsolate brothers. The only account he could give of himself was, that he remembers reading on, regularly, till he came to the following pathetic description of a drowned tradesman, beyond which he recollects nothing."

Then follows a quotation from the discourse, and the review concludes :

"This extract will suffice for the style of the sermon. The charity itself is above all praise."

The following from "Peter Plymley's Letters," while serving our immediate purpose, may possibly give comfort to timid American Protestants :

"As for the enormous wax candles, and superstitious mummeries, and painted jackets of the Catholic priests, I fear them not. Tell me that the world will return again under the influence of the small-pox ; that Lord Castlereagh will hereafter oppose the power of the court ; that Lord Howick and Mr. Grattan will do each of them a mean and dishonorable action ; that any body who has heard Lord Redesdale speak once will knowingly and willingly hear him again ; that Lord Eldon has assented to the fact of two and two making four, without shedding tears, or expressing the smallest doubt or scruple—tell me any other thing absurd or incredible, but for the love of common sense, let me hear no more of the danger to be apprehended from the general diffusion of Popery. It is too absurd to be reasoned upon ; every man feels it is nonsense when he hears it stated, and so does every man while he is stating it."

We can not refrain from giving one extract from the letters to Archdeacon Singleton. We are strongly tempted to give many, but this one will illustrate Smith's inimitable manner of putting

things, and exhibit at the same time some good common sense in what is put:

"Then a picture is drawn of a clergyman with £130 per annum, who combines all moral, physical, and intellectual advantages; a learned man dedicating himself intensely to the care of his parish, of charming manners and dignified deportment, six feet two inches high, beautifully proportioned, with a magnificent countenance expressive of all the cardinal virtues and the Ten Commandments, and it is asked with an air of triumph if such a man as this will fall into contempt on account of his poverty? But substitute for him an average, ordinary, uninteresting minister; obese, dumpy, neither ill-natured nor good-natured; neither learned nor ignorant; striding over the stiles to church, with a second-rate wife—dusty and deliquescent—and four parochial children, full of catechism and bread and butter; or, let him be seen in one of those Shem-Ham-and-Japheth buggies, made on Mount Ararat soon after the subsidence of the waters, driving in the High-street of Edmondton, among all his pecuniary, saponaceous, oleaginous parishioners: can any man of common sense say that all these outward circumstances of the ministers of religion have no bearing on religion itself?"

We have given these specimens of his style, not because they are the best—for his popular essays and lectures are far more chaste and elegant—but as fairly indicating, upon the whole, his peculiarities of expression and manner. We have space for only a few words concerning his preaching. This, however, is not matter for regret. He was, according to our standard, a very poor preacher. He did not, of course, in the selection of his subjects, get as far from the Bible as many of our contemporaries manage to do. The "Pacific Railroad," the "Gold Panic," "Woman's Rights," or the "Presidential Election," would never have been chosen by him, even if he had had the good fortune to live in the days of these new Gospel themes. He claimed to be a "practical" preacher. The creed was regarded by him as something settled, and it only remained to enforce the Ten Commandments and such practical duties as the times demanded. By practical subjects he meant such as Honesty, Truthfulness, Temperance, Popular Education, War, Riches, Pride, and the like—all, certainly, proper themes for the pulpit on suitable occasions, and in proper measure and proportion. But his mistake was in *confining* himself to such subjects. Hence, his sermons, saving an occasional allusion to the Savior and the Scriptures, were nothing more than dissertations that might have been delivered by Seneca or Cicero. Very beautiful and elegant they may be, but they are not the Gospel; fine moral essays, but not preaching.

There is something very specious, but very delusive, in the idea that mere practical preaching—in this limited sense of the term “practical”—is sufficient. Certainly, all preaching has reference, either remotely or directly, to practice; but any effort to improve the fruit which does not begin with the tree—any attempt to make men good which does not point them to Christ as the only source of their goodness—any preaching of a morality which is not to spring from religious faith and motive—is unworthy of a preacher, and is, in fact, a renunciation of the Gospel. It may make clean the outside of the cup and the platter, but it leaves them foul within; it may whitewash our human sepulchers, but they are sepulchers still.

As evidence of this, compare the effect of Smith's preaching with that of Whitefield, or Wesley, or Spurgeon. These all, let us say, stood upon the same plane; all had access to the great multitude; all labored earnestly to make men better. Smith proceeded upon the supposition that the Church is to be her own expositor in matters of doctrine, and that her expositions are already fully given in her Liturgy and Homilies. Hence, he tacitly referred his hearers to these sources for their doctrine, while he declaimed against vice and persuaded to virtue. The others ended where he began. They told men of their sin, and guilt, and condemnation; of their spiritual ruin and helplessness; of their need of a Savior to pardon, and cleanse, and sanctify, as a prerequisite to good works. The one recognized the truth as it lay in the dust-covered Homily, the others planted that truth afresh in the heart and conscience; the one sought to induce men to improve their conduct, the others to make them cry out, “What must we do to be saved?” Under the preaching of the latter, these great truths took possession of men's souls—changed them, purified them, sanctified them—permeated them with new *principles* of conduct, gave them a new object, and animated them with a new hope; and thus, making the tree good, they made its fruit also good. Whereas, with all his learning, his talents, his earnestness, (for in the pulpit, at least, he was earnest,) with all his wonderful logic and rhetoric, his genius, eloquence, popularity, if Sydney Smith ever converted one sinner from the error of his way, its record has escaped us.

Gilfillan is right. He had mistaken his calling. His heart was not in it. Entering it originally from worldly motives, he never lost

VOL. II.—32

sight of those motives. We do not say that he was a hypocrite. He was not. But, having been brought up in a politico-ecclesiastical institution which offered splendid prizes for professional services, he simply illustrated the spirit of the establishment. Indeed, he openly declared that it was the chance of drawing one of those prizes which induced men of learning and talents such as his to enter the Established ministry.

After this frank avowal we turn from him as a preacher without regret. We may admire the *man* for the intellectual independence which distinguished him, for the courage and success with which he opposed venerated traditions and consecrated prejudices—we can not but join with him in the hearty laugh with which, when argument succeeded not, he put out of countenance the ridiculous arrogance of prescription, dullness, and dignity; but, while we sympathize with his humor and laugh at his jokes, while we applaud his majestic self-reliance and leonine boldness, and while we learn wisdom from his philosophy—his sound, practical philosophy of every-day life—let us, at the same time, be admonished by his failures, and avoid his mistakes, his follies, and his excesses.

V.—REGENERATION—THE NEW BIRTH.

“Ye must be born again.”—JOHN III.

DURING a period of four thousand years, from the creation and fall of man to the Messiah, there was no kingdom of God upon earth, no person born again, and no Christians. Abel, Enoch, and Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Moses, Samuel, and the prophets, and all the saints of the patriarchal and Jewish ages, were, in their highest spiritual relations, servants, only servants, of God; none attained to the dignity, honor, and privilege of being, or being called, a son or a daughter. Though changed in heart and life, though myriads believed in God, revered and obeyed him, enjoyed the smiles of his favor, and died prepared to enter his everlasting kingdom above, they were, in the Scriptural sense, unregenerate; out of Christ, and out of his kingdom here, for it was not yet set up. “The Lord thy God,” said Moses to the Jews, “will raise up unto thee a prophet, from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken.” (Deut. xviii, 15.) “And in the days of these kings,” said Daniel, “shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people—it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever.” (Daniel ii, 44.) “The Lord hath sworn,” said David, “and will not repent; Thou art a Priest forever, after the order of Melchizedek.” (Psalms cx, 4.) It was reserved for Him, the “only begotten of the Father,” the Great Prophet, the Priest “after the order of Melchizedek”—this “kingdom of God” being announced as “at hand”—to establish it, and to reign over it.

Nicodemus, “a teacher in Israel,” and “a ruler of the Jews,” had heard of him and of his preaching concerning it, and he came to Jesus by night to inquire further, and listen to his instructions: “You must be born again,” answered our Lord to him. Nicodemus asks, “How?” Our Lord tells him, and also tells what the birth is—its nature; in what it consists. So all who read or hear read the Scripture record of this conversation between them understand it.

There is no question about it thus far. The Divine original, *Δεῖ υμᾶς γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν*, means to us all alike, "*you must be born again.*" But the *what* and the *how* are differently understood. Scholars differ in expounding the words to give the sense.

Γεννω, from which *γεννηθῆναι* is made, in the passive infinitive, in the active voice is predicated only of *males*, and is translated *beget*; when, in the passive voice, it embraces the whole process of generation, it can only be translated *born*.

Ἀνωθεν, which qualifies *γεννηθῆναι* here, and is predicated of *ὑμᾶς*, means, *of place*, "above or from above," *of time*, "from the first or beginning again." Nicodemus obviously understood it only of time, but our Lord meant it of time and place: "You must be born again from above." So he explains: "You must be born of *ὕδωρ* and of *πνεῦμα*." Of *ὕδωρ*, what it meant, and what is the proper English word by which to translate it, there is no question. It means *water*, and water is the word by which it is translated here and elsewhere—everywhere else. But of *πνεῦμα* there is question. What is the meaning, and what should be the word in English to translate *πνεῦμα*? I have now before me, in one of our periodicals, a discussion of this question, from an able and learned writer, in which, for *πνεῦμα*, John iii, 8, he commits himself to the "*wind*." "The difficulty," he says, "which embarrasses most persons, is about the Greek word *πνεῦμα*. It occurs *five* times in the course of *four* verses, (John iii, 5-8,) and two of these are in verse eight. In four places it is translated *spirit*, and in one, *wind*. Why is this?" Yes, this is the "*difficulty*," and *Why* is the question. "What reason can be given to justify a translator in changing the word in English, when the Savior did not change it in his discourse to Nicodemus?" He assumes that "there is no invariable rule forbidding us to translate by different English words the same Greek word, repeated, as this is, in several sentences and clauses in close connection; if there were, the investigation would be foolish." Let us see. Under the head of "TRANSLATION," he says, "In four places—of John iii, 3-8—we find *πνεῦμα* is translated *spirit*, and in one, *wind*. Why is this?" And why, we ask, is it, in the record of our Lord's first three utterances of it here, translated *spirit*? If because *spirit* is its primary, specific, and common meaning, how is this ascertained? This writer understands, as do all translators from Greek into English, that *πνεῦμα*, in these first

three utterances of it, means *spirit*, that it should be so translated, and so, accordingly, it is translated in all the English versions of the New Testament that we have ever seen. No one in them has it translated by any other word.

In *translation* we have, or ought to have, the right words for giving this common, proper, and true sense of the original, which each one has, standing alone; that is, its primary and specific sense. In *exposition* we may inquire further—inquire after its secondary, more remote, and figurative meanings. We may ask how—whether literally or figuratively—it is to be taken in the passage before us; and may, if wanting, supply a word or words to make more clear to others the sense we see, or think we see, to be in it, which, in translating, we are not authorized to do. We return to *πνευμα*. What is the meaning of *πνευμα*? And what is the right word to give its sense in English? Does *πνευμα*, standing alone, mean any thing? If so, what? Certainly, it means *something*, for it is a “substantive,” or “noun,” and “a noun is the name of *something*”—of something that exists. It must, therefore, have a meaning, a fixed and definite meaning, like every other word. What is that meaning? How shall we begin now, and how proceed to ascertain it? Two methods offer. One is, to look it out in all the places of its occurrence in the book or books we have at hand. If, in all these, the sense is the same, take *it*. If, among them, there appear to be two or more different meanings, requiring different words to translate it into our language, count them, count its occurrences in one sense, and then in the other or others, and take that for its primary and proper signification which has the majority. This is called the “arithmetical” method. The other is, to look at it only in the sentence or sentences we have before us to translate. To ascertain, first, whether it be a noun, verb, adjective, or other part of speech. If a noun, whether it be a “leading noun” of the sentence; if so, consider its sense “as indeterminate till its predicate and other adjuncts have been considered;” then ask, “What are these words in this passage, and what sense do they constrain us to put upon *πνευμα*?” This is *scholarly*. “When a scholar,” one “capable of original investigation,” “comes to a word that has several meanings,” we are told “he is not to count them;” “he sees,” or is to see, “at once how it stands related to other words—what is said of it, what its regimen in syntax and thought—

and he applies to it, in short, the principles, not of arithmetic, but of language, and so makes his selection of the meaning proper to the place." No matter whether the meaning which he, the scholar, sees, the thought which he thinks to be in it be in the word anywhere else or not, this meaning is *the* meaning, and *this* thought is *the* thought, as he sees and thinks them. Which method shall we adopt? May we not combine the two? or, using the "arithmetical," add to it so much of the "scholarly" as to consider the relations of this "leading noun" to other words; its "regimen in syntax and thought," not ignoring its determinateness in sense so far as already fixed, and not assuming for it anywhere more than it really has? We will try.

The word is *πνευμα*; and the sense we are now after is its common, primary, and true sense—the meaning it has when standing by itself, alone. This it is which, we are told, must be found, determined, and given in translation, by some other than the arithmetical method, before this method can be used at all. We are after this sense. As I have supposed that *πνευμα* has such a meaning, I here assume that it has. And as I know not any other way to get at it, than by considering its many occurrences connected with other words, and conclude that what it means in the majority of these is this sense, I so decide, and will decide, till better instructed.

What, therefore—the question returns—is the meaning of *πνευμα*? Is it "*air*?" The atmosphere put in motion by caloric, or the want of it, whose "coming" and "going" proceed immediately from a physical cause? Or, does it mean that "*air*" in motion, whose "whence" for coming is the lungs of an animal, whose "whither" for going is from its, his, or her nostrils or mouth, and may or may not depend upon a will? Or, does it mean something different from either of these—back of and altogether superior to them in its nature—having in it life, intelligence, and volition? If the first, it is *wind*. If the second, it is *breath*. If the third, it is *spirit*.

Πνευμα has been translated into our language by all these different words. Yes, and that, too, in this third chapter of John, eighth verse. Wickliffe, the first and oldest of English translators of the New Testament, leads off with *spirit*; Wakefield gives us *breath*, and the authors of King James's, the common version, *wind*.

"The spirit brethith," says Wickliffe.

"The breath breathes," says Wakefield.

"The wind bloweth," say King James's translators.

Which is right? Which word here—*spirit*, *breath*, or *wind*—gives the sense of the divine original? Which its primary, most common, and specific meaning?

Πνευμα *is* and *represents* an entity. The entity it is, in my manuscript and on the printed page before me, is word—a Greek word, a substantive or noun—a “leading noun” in the sentence. The entity it represents, or, rather, the entities, for it represents more than one, namely, the thing and the sense signified by it as a word, is *spirit*, or *breath*, or *wind*; or it is the vocal utterance of itself, and means *something*. This, the meaning of *πνευμα*, in the right English word to express it, is what we are now seeking. Does it mean something *material*, or *immaterial*, matter or spirit? Is *spirit* the existing entity? The word *spirit*, the representative word in English for *πνευμα* in Greek, which our Lord uttered, which Nicodemus heard, which the Apostle John wrote, and which we have now before us, visible on the printed page? Or is it *breath*? Or is it *wind*? Which word for the thing should we have, and have it here?

Πνευμα is a Greek word. “Pronounce this word to a Greek,” we are told, “and he is in doubt whether you mean *wind* or *spirit*, for he knows it is used for both, but add *πνει* (blows) and he at once understands that you mean by *πνευμα* wind, because the Greek never says the spirit *blows*.” But Nicodemus was, probably, a Hebrew, not a Greek, and “in the case before us it should be remembered that our Savior, in speaking to a ‘teacher in Israel,’ did not, in all probability, use the Greek language, but the vernacular common to them both. *In this language there is no other word for wind but ruach, the one which the Savior had already used for spirit.*”

Mark this: “Which,” the word our Lord here pronounced to the ears of Nicodemus for *πνευμα* in Greek, was ריח “*ruach*.” Note again: This word *ruach* he had already used before in this conversation, “in the sense of *spirit*.” But *ruach* also meant *wind*. It was the only word in the Hebrew language which our Lord *could* have used to express this material entity. For which, “spirit” or “wind,” did our Lord use it in the utterance recorded in the eighth verse? How to Nicodemus did *ruach* “sound?” Like *πνευμα* to a Greek? Was he in doubt whether our Lord meant by it *wind* or *spirit*? Suppose he was, and that not until he heard the utterance of *nahshav*, the Hebrew word for *πνει*, did he understand it? But in the three preced-

ing utterances of *ruach* our Lord meant by it *spirit*. Why? and how do we know this? The why must be in because "spirit" was the primary and more common signification of *ruach*, not "wind," and because our Lord intended that Nicodemus should so understand him. But if he understood him to speak of spirit in the first and second and third utterances of *ruach*, how do we know that our Lord did not mean by *ruach* spirit, and that Nicodemus did not so understand him in the fourth and fifth utterances of it, in this connection? The word *nahshav* and the other Hebrew words following for *πνευ*, *θελει*, *ακουεις*, and *φωνη*, predicated of *ruach* and of Nicodemus, must determine this, if the "leading noun," its common, primary, and most specific sense, does not. But why should *ruach*, or *πνευμα*, be governed in sense by *nahshav*, or *πνευ*, or by any other predicate, more than the predicate by it, the subject? Is it so? It is not, grammatically. The nominative case is not governed, but governs the verb. And it is not in *sense* either, for neither of these predicates is more significant, or has its sense more fixed and certain, standing alone, than the subject-noun. Why should it? It should not. It being ascertained, therefore, no matter how, and admitted that *ruach*, or *πνευμα*, in the first and second and third utterances of it here by our Lord, meant *spirit*, we are not to consider its sense as indeterminate in the fourth utterance of it, but to be *spirit* still. And as the nominative case governs the verb, in syntax, grammatically, so also does the sense of the "leading noun," the subject in this case, govern the sense of the verb and the other adjuncts.

What sense, therefore, we may now ask, does *ruach*, or *πνευμα*, in this passage (John iii, 8), "constrain" us to put on *nahshav* or *πνευ*, etc., and what English words use to express their sense?

It is assumed that our Lord, in this conversation, "intended to speak" both of the *spirit* and *wind*, and institute a comparison between them. If so, and if in it he used not the Greek, but the Hebrew language, it follows, of course, that to do it "he had no alternative but to repeat *ruach* in the sense of wind, which he had already used in the sense of *spirit*, and then to indicate the change of sense by other words which he would associate with it." But if this conversation was in Greek—if our Lord intended to speak both of spirit and wind, and spoke of spirit thrice by *πνευμα*, as his Apostle John here records, he having in the Greek language another word, namely,

ανεμος, for wind, and "evidently a more precise and definite word for his purpose to express wind, even if πνευμα still retained along with its sense of spirit the meaning also of air in motion or wind," he certainly *might have used it*. That he *did not*, and that John, in recording what he said, *did not*, but used again πνευμα, and again and again, is strong presumptive evidence that no such thought or intention at this time was in our Lord's mind; that what πνευμα meant in his first and second and third utterances of it, it meant, also in the fourth alike with the fifth. But in all, save the fourth, and in the record of them, πνευμα meant *spirit*. So all translators translate, and so all commentators comment upon it. That to be "born again" our Lord said to Nicodemus, "You must be born," not of wind, but "of *spirit*;" that "that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the *spirit* is spirit;" that the *spirit* does that which πνει means for it, and "so is every one who is born of the *spirit*." Certainly, our Lord, conversing with Nicodemus in Greek, *could* have used for wind here, had he intended wind, the word ανεμος, which would have best expressed it—which word for wind he so used elsewhere; yes, and with πνεω, too. (See Matt. vii, 25: επνευσαν οι ανεμοι, "the winds blew.") And if, in Hebrew, he uttered *ruach* here for wind, his Apostle, John, recording what he said, *could* so have translated his intention. That John was "bound by Greek usage" not to do so, but "to employ the word πνευμα even where our Lord meant wind, because of the generic conception of air, or atmospheric motion, or agency intended in the passage," has been said, I am aware, but not proved. We have the *dixit et præterea nihil*, it wants proof; but no such "Greek usage" can be shown, we think. What "generic conception" that ανεμος would not have expressed? "*Ανεμος*," says the scholar, "is only a more definite form of atmospheric motion, a specific state of the air, a wind, as distinguished from the gentler or more generic motion of the air." If so, if here, in the eighth verse, our Lord said or meant to say to Nicodemus, "the wind blows, and you hear its sound," ανεμος and not πνευμα was the word required; for not a gentle breathing, but a breeze, a blowing with force, was what he meant; such a blowing as to be audible.

"*Ανεμος*," we are told, "occurs thirty times in the New Testament, and its meaning here is specific in every case." Right. It uniformly means, and is translated in the New Testament, *wind*. In

four of these thirty times it stands as "the leading noun" before *πνεω*, and indicates for it in English the word *blow*, though only once does it so stand in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament,* where, and in forty-eight other passages, it is the translation of *ruach*, which, in the common English version of it, is also rendered *wind*. But how do we know that "wind" in English is the meaning of *ανεμος* in Greek, and that by this English word "wind" it should be translated? We know it by this common *use* of it. "Use," said the Latin poet and philosopher, Horace, "is the arbiter of language" (*"Arbitrium est usus loquendi"*). It was because it was so used by the writers of the Septuagint, when and where they wrote, that we know that then and there *ανεμος* meant "wind." And because it was and is so used by other writers elsewhere, and at other times, we know that it so meant and means elsewhere, and at those other times. But in John iii, 8, we have no *ανεμος*, and, consequently, no "wind," unless it be found in another word, *πνευμα*. Have we it in this?

By opening again our Hebrew and Greek Bibles, or our concordances of them, we find that this word *πνευμα* occurs in them about four hundred times as the translation of *ruach*, meaning *spirit*, and seventy-three times meaning *wind*; that in two of these seventy-three, so translated, it is the "leading noun," and followed by *πνεω* as its predicate; namely, Psalms cxlvii, 18 (Sep. cxlvii, 7), and Isaiah xl, 8 (Heb. and Eng. Bible xl, 7). In the first of these, *πνευμα πνευσει αυτου*, John Calvin, in his "Librum Psalmorum Commentarius," translates, "*flabit spiritus ejus*"—his spirit shall blow—while Rosenmüller, *in loc.*, gives us "*spirare facit ventum suum*"—he makes his wind to breathe. Wind may either *blow* or *breathe*, and so, also, may a living, voluntary agent; but *breathe*, in sound and sense, better agrees with *πνευμα*, meaning *spirit*. We now open the New Testament, and our concordance of it in Greek. What, we ask, was the *use* of *πνευμα* here? But, first, another question: What does the Old Testament Septuagint use of it show? It shows that when that translation was made, some three hundred years before Christ, *πνευμα* had in it, "along with the meaning of *spirit*, that, also, of air in motion, or wind." That it had in it this meaning, then: first, *spirit*; secondly, *breath*; thirdly, *wind*. But whether or not it retained this double or

* Apocrypha, Sirach xliii, 20. (in some editions xliii, 24).

triple sense down to New Testament times, the use of *πνευμα* by the New Testament writers must determine. What, therefore, was the New Testament use of *πνευμα*? We find it in *four* of its *five* utterances by our Lord, here recorded by John, to be *spirit*. In this all agree. What is it elsewhere? We look, and look in vain, for any other meaning in its translation by another word. We count, and find it occurs here three hundred and eighty odd times, in all of which it is *spirit*—so means, and is so translated. That once, *only one occurrence of it*, that in John iii, 8, between four of *spirit*, in the same paragraph, is it by any one rendered *wind*. What, therefore, does *this use here* say to us for *πνευμα*? It says unmistakably to all "arithmetical critics," and to some others also, that it means *spirit, spirit primarily*; and saying this of it in the first three utterances and record of it, in John iii, 5, 6, it says the same of the fourth and fifth in the eighth verse, the subject, the new birth, being unchanged. But the word *πνευμα*, in the record of its fourth utterance here by our Lord (com. Eng. version), is rendered *wind*! And why? "We find the answer," it is said, "in the force of *οὕτως* (so), which introduces a comparison. The *wind* is appealed to by our Savior as an illustration to soften the astonishment of Nicodemus." Is it so? Is it not rather from a misconception, in the mind of the translator, of what our Lord here said and did? a "conception" of *wind* in *πνευμα*, where no wind was? a "conception" of "a comparison" where none was instituted? To show this would be to expound the meaning. We are now on the translation. Enough, for the present, on *πνευμα*.

We proceed, therefore, to THE ADJUNCTS AND PREDICATES.

These, of *πνευμα*, are, *γενναω*, *πνεω*, *θελω*, *φωνη*, *ερχομαι*, and *υπαγω*—five verbs and one substantive. In *γενναω*, the first of them, in the passive voice, and infinitive mood, potential, we have the subject of discourse, in which is also the predicate of another word, namely, of *υδωρ*, while in *ακουω* and *ουκ οιδας* we have what is predicated of Nicodemus. All common words, the significations of which we have only to open our lexicons to ascertain at once, and then to note, in connection, the "leading nouns," with their "regimen in syntax," and the words for their translation are fixed.

Γενναω is defined thus: "*Spoken of men*, to beget, generate, of *women*, to bring forth, bear, give birth to, pass, to be born, produced." In the text before us, therefore, we translate it "born," and *γεννηθηναι*

ανωθεν, "be born again," or "born from above." Nicodemus understood it, we think, as before said, simply of time again, and literally *to be born*; hence his exclamation, "How can these things be?" Our Lord proceeds to tell him, "You must be born of 'ὕδωρ (*water*), and of πνεῦμα (*spirit*)". Water and spirit being thus put together, we see at once that γεννηθῆναι here must be translated "born" rather than "begotten," embracing the whole process of the birth.

Πνεω is defined, "to breathe," "to blow," either of which words gives its primary, literal signification. It occurs in the New Testament seven times, in four of which it follows as a predicate of ἀνεμος ("wind"), once of Νότος (the "south wind"), in which five places it is properly translated *blow*, and it is in them so translated, and once as a participle substantively, where it is rendered for a noun, *wind*. In John iii, 8, *only* is it found in the New Testament as the predicate of πνεῦμα (*spirit*), where this, its subject and governing nominative, indicates for the translation *breathes*.

Θελω occurs in the New Testament over two hundred times, and primarily means, "to will and be willing." It is so defined. It is nowhere predicated of ἀνεμος, but always and every-where in its primary sense of living beings. So here of πνεῦμα.

Φωνη means *voice*—that articulate sound produced by the organs of speech—and occurs in the New Testament one hundred and thirty-six times, in all which it is translated "voice," except in nine, where it is predicated of things inanimate, and rendered "sound" and "noise."

Ἐρχομαι and ὑπαγω, translated "come" and "go," mean these and no mistake. As there is no question about it, we need not make any counts of the occurrences of these words. They are very common, and of frequent occurrence, as also are their qualifying adverbs, ποθεν ("whence"), and που ("whither").

That ἀκουω means "hear," οὐκ "not," and εἶδω "know," as translated and predicated of Nicodemus, is likewise unquestioned and unquestionable. This, then, of what Jesus said, is our translation:

"Verily, verily, I say to you, unless a man be born again, he can not see the Kingdom of God. . . . Unless a man be born of water and of Spirit, he can not enter into the Kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Wonder not that I said to you, You must be born again. The

Spirit breathes where he pleases, and you hear his voice, but know not whence he comes and whither he goes; so is every one who is born of the Spirit." (John iii, 3-8.)

Now for AN EXPOSITION.

What is this "Kingdom of God?" When and where established? What is it to "see" and what to "enter" it? What is it to be "born again?" The begetter? With what, in what, and how? The mother? How is the begotten conceived, and how and when brought forth? The *nature* of this birth. What words in this conversation are to be understood literally, and what figuratively? Can any word or words wanting from ellipsis be supplied to make the sense more clear?

The "kingdom" of which our Lord here speaks was obviously that which he and his disciples were then preaching as "at hand," of which he had been anointed King at his baptism, when the Holy Spirit descended in the bodily form of a dove, alighted on and disappeared in him—when the voice from heaven proclaimed, "This is my Son, the beloved, in whom I delight. Hear him." It was set up on the day of Pentecost, the first after his crucifixion and resurrection, when he was crowned, and was identical with the Church then established. He was the King, the Head, his disciples the subjects and members, and its territory was their location—the earth. But, though "set up" on the earth, it was not earthly in its character. It was spiritual and heavenly, destined to continue through all time, and finally to be merged in the "everlasting kingdom" of God the Father.

Nicodemus had heard of it—had heard of Jesus and of his preaching it. He had come to inquire, when our Lord, knowing what was in his heart, startled him with the declaration, "You must be born again." Before you can "see," and in order to your "entering" it, Nicodemus, you must be regenerated.

"Regeneration" and "the new birth," or to "be regenerated" and "born again," mean the same. *What* it was, *how* it was, and *all about it* our Lord now tells, and explains to this "teacher in Israel," for his sake and for ours.

As we "see" a State or Commonwealth, so a kingdom or a Church—not with the bodily eye, physically, but mentally, with the eye of the mind; we discern, we understand. And, in like manner, we "enter" it by complying with the conditions of citizenship or

membership in it. In being "born again" our Lord taught that the subject of this birth would both "see" and "enter" the Kingdom of God. In saying, "You must be born of water and of Spirit," he tells the *how* of the act of birth, and uses the words "water" and "Spirit" in their primary, literal sense.* You must be born of water by being immersed into and emerged from it. You must be born of the Spirit—the Holy Spirit—by being, previous to this immersion, begotten by it.

"In the natural world a man is born of that from which he proceeds, and of that by which he is begotten. So, in the spiritual world, a man who is born again has come forth from water as from the womb, having been previously begotten by the Spirit. As, in the natural world, a child can not be born of his father until he is born of his mother, so, in the spiritual world, no one can be said to be born of the Spirit until he has first been born of water."†

"That which is born of the flesh is flesh." This is true in nature, literally, of all so born. "And," our Lord adding, *"that which is born of the Spirit is spirit,"* tells us that it is alike true of all who are "born again." This is what the new birth is. It is an impartation and reception of the begetting Spirit. So we become the children of God. "Behold what manner of love the Father has bestowed upon us, that we should be called sons of God! Therefore the world knows us not, because it knew him not." (1 John iii, 1.)

Our Lord proceeds: *"The Spirit breathes where he pleases."* How breathes? Not, as an animal, the air; but, as Spirit, in his own way, his own *aura*, so as to cause a speaking, an utterance to be heard as his voice. *"And you hear his voice."* Nicodemus heard and was then hearing it by the mouth of him who ever spoke by the Holy Spirit. *"But you know not whence he comes and whither he goes."* He was ignorant of this. And we, too, may or may not be alike ignorant

* It will be observed that πνευμα here in the fifth, also in the sixth verse, occurs without the article before it, and is so translated (Com. Ver.) in the sixth. It should be so in the fifth verse—"born of spirit," not of *the* Spirit. But in the eighth verse we have the article, which indicates a living, intelligent, divine agent—namely, the Holy Spirit. If in the fifth and sixth verses πνευμα does not mean this, but the "word of truth," as in John iv, 11, 13, 14; vi, 63, and vii, 38, 39, very well. The sense of "spirit" being in the word "water," and the sense of "word" being in the word "spirit," authorizes no change in the translation, but may indicate "word" as the meaning of πνευμα in its first two occurrences—John iii, 5, 6. If so, it affects not our exposition otherwise than to confirm it. "You must be born of water and word"—the Word of God. The "word" is the "incorruptible seed." In it we hear the "voice of the Spirit;" believing, we are begotten *by* it, or *of* it, by the Spirit, and when born of water, also, we are born of the Spirit and of God.

† "Discipulus," *alias* "R. R.," Mill. Harb., Vol. I, for 1830, p. 206.

here, not knowing the "whence" or the "whither" of his coming or going, and yet, through others, *hear his voice*. We hear it by the mouth of Apostles and prophets, who spoke and wrote as they were moved by the same Holy Spirit.

Our Lord adds, "*So.*" *So what?* Not *so the wind* blows, nor *so the Spirit operates*, like the *blowing wind*; but "*so, in this way, is born again, born from above, every one who is born of the Spirit.*" The import and force of *οὕτως* ("so") here is not "comparison," but explanation. "*So is born*" ("is born" for *εστί*, properly translated "is") "*every one who is born of the Spirit.*" The doctrine is, By the "breathing of the Spirit" his "voice" is heard; by the hearing of his voice, somehow, a begetting of the Spirit is effected; and then, by being "born of water," this new birth of which our Lord speaks is fully accomplished.

But *how*, it may be asked, is there a begetting of the Spirit by the hearing of his voice? In the voice of the Spirit is the Word of God—the Gospel. "This," says Paul, "is the power of God to salvation to every one who believes it." (Romans i, 16.) Again, "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." In the Word is the *seed*; by this the Spirit operates. *So it is* that every one who hears and believes is begotten by the Spirit.

That this, our exposition of our Lord's teaching in his conversation with Nicodemus, recorded John iii, 3-8, is the true one, or according to truth, will appear, I think, by considering with it, further, what more he said to this "ruler of the Jews" in answer to his question, repeated in the ninth verse, "How can these things be?" and some other Scriptures.

"If I have told you *earthly things*," says our Lord; that is, *things of earth*—the kingdom about to be set up on earth, and the way to enter it. These "things" apply not to the "heavenly" or to the Kingdom of God in another world, in which will be the redeemed and saints of all ages—the unregenerate as well as the regenerated—according to this Scripture. "And I say unto you that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven." (Matthew viii, 11.) Our Lord continues: "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." (John iii, 14,

15.) In these and what follows, to the end of verse twenty-two, we have the Gospel of the love of God in Christ, proclaimed by himself. So the Spirit "breathed," and so Nicodemus heard his "voice." And in the twenty-second and twenty-third verses it is recorded: "After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea, and there he tarried with them and baptized. And John was baptizing in Enon, near Salim, because there was much water there; and they came and were baptized." Here is the "water," and here we are informed how those "begotten by the Spirit" were born of it. To this also agrees the beginning of John's testimony. Speaking of our Lord as the "light of the world," and of his "reception in it," he says: "He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, to them that believe on his name; who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of men, but of God." (John i, 11-13.) Mark it: "Which were born"—that is, *born again*; "born of God" by believing in Jesus and being baptized into him—into his body, the Church, and into his kingdom, the Kingdom of God. To this agrees the preaching of Peter, and all else that was said and done on the day of Pentecost, as recorded in the second chapter of Acts of the Apostles. They were "filled with the Holy Spirit," and "spoke as the Spirit gave them utterance." They preached the Gospel. "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized." Again said Peter, in his first General Epistle "to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia:" "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth, through the Spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently; being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." (1 Peter i, 22, 23.) And a little further on, after speaking of Noah and his family as "saved by water" in the ark, he says: "The like figure whereunto, *even* baptism, doth also now save us, (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." (Chap. iii, 21.) Our souls are "purified by obeying the truth through the Spirit," "being born again."

Of the Church, Paul, to the Ephesians, says that it is "sanctified and cleansed with a bath of water by the Word," (Eph. v, 26,)

and to Titus, "But after that the kindness and love of God, our Savior, toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we had done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly, through Christ, our Savior." (Tit. iii, 4-6.) The "bath of water by the Word," and the "washing" or "bath of regeneration," by which the Apostle here says we are "cleansed" and "saved," obviously mean the same thing; and it is what our Lord meant when he said to Nicodemus, "You must be born again; unless a man be born again, he can not see the Kingdom of God; unless a man be born of water and of Spirit, he can not enter into the Kingdom of God." And so, by the Spirit's breathing; by the speaking so caused; by the words so uttered, in which his voice is heard, believed, and the believer begotten by him; and by repentance, and by baptism, the Gospel obeyed, the kingdom is seen, is entered, and Christ also; we are regenerated, born again, become new creatures; old things pass away, behold, all things become new. Thus Christ is formed in us, the "hope of glory," and we are made partakers of his salvation.

VI.—PROPHETIC INSPIRATION.

SUPERNATURALISM is inwrought into the very fabric of the Bible, and into the very texture of the religion of the Bible. No candid reader of that wonderful volume can possibly fail to perceive this. Prophets appear, according to the representation of truth there made, and speak in the name of God. They work astonishing miracles. The Son of God becomes incarnate. He teaches as from the Supreme Father, and his mighty works fill the beholders with adoring amazement, or with baffled rage, according to their position in regard to his claims. His Apostles preach the Gospel under Divine guidance, "the Lord opens" many hearts to receive it, the inspired teachers perform miracles like those of the prophets. The Holy Spirit is granted to believers always as a renovating, sanctifying

helper, sometimes as the giver of extraordinary powers and endowments. Remove this feature from Christianity, it becomes a mere name. Remove it from the Bible, it becomes a mere book of fables, dreams, and riddles, fit only for priests to juggle with, and sophists to adapt to any use they please.

The open unbeliever faces the Bible and Christianity in this light, and he does it squarely. Supernaturalism, he says, is a cheat, Christianity an imposture, the Bible a "pack of lies." Shocking as his ribaldry is, well would it be if there were nothing more dangerous in the line of skepticism. For his bald infidelity repels by its own deformity, while the issue between him and us, the disciples of Christ, is a perfectly clear one. It is easily stated, and, thank God! as easily decided.

But we of to-day have a more insidious foe to deal with. The world is at present infested with a class of writers and teachers—dreamy pantheists, scornful "naturalists," polite semi-infidels, and (so-called) "liberal Christians." They profess respect for Christianity, but it is feigned. If they use Christian phraseology, it is in a perverted sense. They may admire the ethics of the Gospel, but they are no more believers in the Holy Oracles than they are in the writings of Plato or Seneca. Their unbelief is masked, but it is real and it is bitter. The sure test brings it out. They do not accept the Gospel as a divine and authoritative message from God, consequently they do in fact utterly reject it. For the Gospel is that, or it is a mockery, a fable, a forgery.

This covert infidelity has largely infected the literature and the public sentiment of our time and country. While "Churchmen" are discussing the question of robes and candles, and while "evangelical Christians" are striving to effect among themselves a union hollow and unreal, because not founded on the rock of eternal truth, this modern unbelief has gone far to sap the nation's faith in the Word of the living God.

"The Peaceful vanishes away;
The moving strife usurps its place;
The cliffs of hallowed faith decay
That girdled once the race."

But so far as this is true, and comparing the precious fruits of humble obedience and faith with the barren follies and desolating

vagaries of this radical *un-religion*, we may well ask for the results for truth and humanity.

"But whither, whither march they on,
Whose steps are as the waters free?
The corn-fields of the Past are gone;
What harvest bears the Sea?"

Without controversy, the foundation of God stands sure. He will vindicate truth and confound error in the end. But the influence of this kind of infidelity upon men has been for them to bring chaos and disorder into the moral universe. Its work in our nation is deadly and wide. Multitudes have no faith in supernatural religion. How has all this been done? Not by argument. The evidences of Christianity are immovable. It is done by a method of barefaced assumption; a mode which would be contemptible if it were not so dangerous; a mode which would not be dangerous if man's corrupt heart did not love to be deceived; a mode which, in spite of its success, is despicable in the eyes of every right-thinking man.

It is the fashion in the quarters referred to, to treat the supernatural element in the Bible as something unreasonable, incredible. The undoubting faith of the devout Christian is accounted as a childish, though perhaps beautiful, superstition, handed down from darker and more ignorant times, which will, as a matter of course, disappear before the progress of science and free thought. Inspiration, miracles, incarnation, the authoritative Gospel, the second coming of Christ, retribution, these are merely human dreams, and must be eliminated from the current Christianity, before it can claim to be a rational religion. Such notions as these are industriously set forth in writings like the "Autocrat of the Breakfast Table," in magazines like the "Atlantic Monthly," in lectures like those of many who might be named. Or if not formally set forth, they are insinuated, represented as the inevitable belief of candid, well-informed men. Those who read or hear begin to think that such authors and speakers must be wondrously wise men. Insensibly they begin to cherish doubts. They grow ashamed of their faith. It dies within them. The command of Jehovah, "*This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; HEAR YE HIM,*" sounds no longer in their ears as once on Hermon; it is to them but as the echo of an ancient myth, of an effete superstition.

Of course in all this there is no argument. It is uttermost folly.

These "blind leaders of the blind" boast of "reason and culture." Their disciples echo back, "reason and culture." But both forget that it is easier to sneer than to argue; easier to assume superiority than to evince it, to talk of reason than to use it; far easier to take for granted than to prove. Now, have these modern semi-infidels and "liberal Christians" ever invalidated the evidences of Christianity? Ah! that is too serious, heavy work for men of their caliber. They have not even attempted it. Therein show they their only wisdom. They avoid direct contact, as by an instinct, with that Rock which has ever ground its assailants to powder. Have they, by sound logic, banished the Gospel from the category of solemn verities? If not, their assumptions are ridiculous and contemptible. Their writings, however witty and plausible, are worthless trash in this world of stern facts.

It is not my object, in this brief article, to display the rock ground of evidence on which the religion of Christ rests.* We believe in Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Son of God. He is to us Savior, Law-giver, and Teacher. His Word is to us the highest authority in the universe. But our modern naturalistic and rationalistic infidels and half-infidels make their boast of "reason." We are willing to meet them on their own ground. We have but to manfully challenge them at the bar of right Reason, and their flippant utterances, justly regarded by the devout believer with horror and dread, will appear to be, as they really are, utterly destitute of any logical and philosophic worth whatever.

Take, for instance, the item of PROPHETIC INSPIRATION. The word "*prophet*" signifies *mouth* or *mouth-piece*; "*inspiration*" signifies *in-breathing*. A *prophet of God* is a man through whom, as through a mouth-piece, he communicates with the race or with any part of it. A prophet is *inspired*; that is, God has *in-breathed* him; he has breathed into him what he utters for and from the Lord. In other words, a Divine impulse and influence move and lead him, direct him

*The object of this article is not positively to argue on the evidences of Christianity, but negatively to expose and brand some of the sophistical assumptions of its adversaries. A sincere doubter, who wishes to know the truth, will do well to read the standard works on the "Evidences of Christianity," such as M'Ilvaine, Gregory, Alexander, Nelson, etc. Especially would we commend him to the study, with all possible helps, but without them if he has them not, of the FOUR GOSPELS. Trace the wonderful life and character of Christ as there displayed. It is too divine, harmonious, and holy to be a creation of fancy. Then it is fact. He is the Son of God, and his Word is truth. I regard this as the best antidote to skepticism, and would unhesitatingly prescribe it. Dr. Schaff's little book on the "Person of Christ" is an excellent companion in studying the four Testimonies.

in his official acts, reveal to him his message, guide him in the utterance or writing of it. Genius does not make a man a prophet, nor do lofty enthusiasm, leadership among men, defense of the right, assault upon the wrong. These may all appear in a prophet, but do not make him one. It is an affront to common sense to call a man a prophet merely on account of these qualities. A prophet is one to whom God has directly spoken, and whom he has then sent to communicate the Divine Word to others. This is the idea of prophetic inspiration. If a man disbelieves that such a thing ever existed, let him say so, but he shall not mystify the truth by falsely using terms with impunity.

The Bible represents that many men, from time to time, have been prophets of God, in this clear and literal sense. Jesus Christ was the great prophet. The Bible was written by prophets. God communicated his will to merely human prophets in a great variety of ways. Moses spoke with God—that is, God, the Son—face to face; others received the Word from angels. Sometimes an audible voice was heard; again, visions of the day or of the night conveyed the message. Often the *Word of Jehovah* came mentally by the Spirit's power. Ofttimes the prophet not only spoke, but acted and prayed, under Divine guidance. Sometimes he predicted future events; sometimes he did not; but he always was a medium of communication between God and men. This is the essential idea of prophetic inspiration.

Moreover, the Divine communication, by whatever mode received, was perfectly unique, at once distinguishable and distinguished by the mind of the prophet from every thing else—from ordinary dreams, thoughts, impressions, impulses. Of course we could not fully understand this matter without being prophets ourselves, but we know that God so spoke to his servants that they instantly and unmistakably recognized his voice, and knew that he was addressing them just as certainly as we know the voice of a friend who converses with us. The message being now received from God by the prophet, he must communicate it by his pen, or by his voice, or by both, to those for whom it is designed. This he does—or he would be no true, inspired prophet—under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, so that the truth passes through his mind unaltered, and reaches those to whom it is sent free from all error, and clothed with Divine authority. It is, indeed, expressed in human language; it is marked with the peculiarities

of the prophet as to style and manner ; it is subject to the necessary limitations of human thought ; but, properly understood, it is truth, all truth, and nothing but the truth.

The credentials of a prophet are, sometimes, fulfillment of predictions, more generally, miracles. I shall not now enter upon the subject of miracles. Perhaps this may be done in the future.

The skeptics to whom I have referred above do not accept prophetic inspiration as a fact. They place the inspired teachers and prophets upon the same level with other men. They admire, criticise, doubt, dissent, sneer at pleasure. They are well aware that the Bible teaches the doctrine of prophetic inspiration as I have stated it, but they account it, nevertheless, to be an ancient superstition. They know that there is a great mass of evidence in favor of the Divine authority of the Bible, but they never grapple with it. They have a most convenient method of disposing of this evidence. They simply *ignore it*. Without having disproved the authority of the Bible, they affect to treat it just as they would any other venerable book that never had any such authority, and they declare, or assume, that the doctrine of prophetic inspiration is an absurdity, a fable, a tradition. There is nothing supernatural about the Bible, according to their representation. Only the superstitious, as they would have it, now believe in such things ; and then, without having proved all this, or having even attempted to do so, they affect to look down with superior wisdom and contemptuous pity upon the devout believer. They boast of Reason. Why, then, should they not be dealt with according to Reason ? Prophetic inspiration, as a fact, is supported by evidence. This evidence our skeptics set aside, without examination, as unworthy of credence. It follows, then, that prophetic inspiration must be a thing impossible or utterly improbable in itself, so that no examination is needed of any alleged evidence, or else that the position of these men is shallow ignorance and contemptible impertinence ; for, if prophetic inspiration be not an intrinsic impossibility, then the evidence may prove it to be a reality, and should be examined. And if prophetic inspiration be not so utterly improbable as to render the idea of it an absurdity to the mind, then the love of truth demands the weighing of the evidence, and the giving of a verdict accordingly. And yet our skeptics are content to *assume* a ground which can be tenable for a moment, only on the supposition that prophetic inspiration

is impossible or utterly improbable. It will be easy, in a few words, to show that such a supposition is grossly false and foolish, but with it go down whole cart-loads of wit, "culture," "reason," and ridicule—down to the level of utter folly.

Is prophetic inspiration impossible? We, who are the finite creatures of God, can communicate our thoughts to each other. If we wish to address persons at a distance we can do so by a messenger or by a letter. If the sender could control his messenger perfectly, he could secure as accurate an expression of his will as if he were to utter it in person. Practically, this can be done to a great degree. If one writes, yet does not choose to write with one's own hand, he can employ an amanuensis, and dictate word for word, or can give to his confidential clerk the substance of the communication, and afterward revise what the clerk has written. Thus, by the mediumship of one of our fellow-creatures, we can convey our *word* to others of our fellow-creatures. Can not, then, the great God, who made us in his own image and likeness, who gave us every power we possess, who is infinite in every perfection, can not he communicate a message to the mind of one of his creatures, and then so guide him in uttering or in writing it as to convey that message through him unaltered to others of his creatures? To ask this question is to answer it.

Is prophetic inspiration improbable; that is, so grossly improbable as to be utterly unworthy of a thought? We are dependent creatures, and we need Divine guidance and help. In the hour of trouble we instinctively call for our Father's aid. To our souls deep, solemn questions come. How shall we please our Maker? Can the guilt of which we are conscious be forgiven? Is there a life after death? if so, will our conduct here affect our destiny hereafter? Is there any possible deliverance from sin and its terrible consequences? Man can not answer these questions. Nature is dumb. Only God can answer. If he refuses to speak to us we have neither light nor hope.

It would be impossible beforehand to judge or predict whether God would or would not have mercy on sinful man, and therefore impossible to judge or predict as to the probability of a revelation, but it is just as probable that there will be a revelation as that there will be mercy; and prophetic inspiration is the method of a revelation.

There is, then, no improbability in the idea of prophetic inspiration, unless it is improbable that God will have mercy on sinful man. In the absence of evidence for that blessed fact, the prospect would indeed be exceedingly dubious, but, then, if there is no revelation, there is no mercy, help, or hope. Isolated, left to the fate we deserve, treated with simple, even-handed justice, it is all over with us forever. What, then, shall we think of that man's state of mind, who, sharing with us in these dread necessities and in this dread guilt, flippantly proclaims that God has never spoken, and then insultingly glories over us in what, if it were true, would leave both himself and us without a ray of hope, either living or dying.

If need, if danger, if instinctive human cries for help, if hope of Divine mercy, if longings for deliverance from sin's bondage, if all these have any weight as to probabilities, then revelation, prophetic inspiration, light from heaven, are probable. Whether God has spoken or not, must be settled, however, by no "guesses at truth." This question must be settled by evidence, as in the case of any other matter of fact. These suggestions, have been made to show that the assumption on the part of modern skeptics, the taking for granted of the improbability or impossibility—in a word, the *absurdity*—of the idea of prophetic inspiration, is a piece of barefaced, impudent, and wicked effrontery.

The great God has had mercy on sinful men. A wondrous scheme of mercy he has planned and executed. Through long ages he spoke to the Jewish "fathers" by the prophets. At length his dear Son appeared, the Light of men, the Savior of the world, the Prophet of prophets, and after he ascended the heavens he sent the good news of peace and life to the nations, by Apostles and prophets. The record of this great salvation we have in the Bible, certified to us by every evidence we can desire. Let us trust and be at peace—let us obey and live. And if men who love not God nor his truth choose to set up for great philosophers; if they call these glorious verities fables; if they assume that God can not speak to us, or that we can not rationally believe that he has so spoken; if, so assuming, they lay irreverent hands upon our Bible, and tell us that faith is superseded, and Christianity is but earthborn—if they choose thus to do and thus to say, what is it to us? Not one of their assumptions have they ever justified. Not one of their positions have they ever

demonstrated. Not one of the evidences of Christianity have they ever invalidated. Every blessed fact remains a fact, though they may call it fiction. Every solid testimony of evidence remains what it is, though they may ignore its existence. Whoever chooses to examine will find that Christianity—I do not say all that is called by that name—but real Christianity, Bible Christianity, rests upon a foundation of solid, impregnable, certain evidence; it is truth—it is fact; calling it otherwise alters nothing.

The lesson suggested by these reflections is this: Christianity, as a divine system, has nothing to fear from modern skepticism. It is only froth and weakness. At the same time souls have every thing to fear from it, we have every thing to fear from it for them. The age is an age of "*light*" literature, and "*light*" minds. The plausible, graceful, insinuating teachings of this enemy suit the temper of the times, which is not a temper sober, solemn, logical, principled. Let us, then, strip these reason-mongers of their gay robes of false philosophy and glittering vanity. Let us press men with the solemn facts of the Gospel, not as theologic theories, but as solemn facts, with testimony sure and eternal to their reality. Let us teach them, as one has written:

"O happiest he of human race,
To whom our God has given grace
To hear, to read, to feel, to pray,
To lift the latch and force the way;
But better had he ne'er been born
Who reads to doubt, or reads to scorn."

VII.—NATURALISM.

The Perfection of Jesus. By REV. JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE. "Old and New," January, 1870.

IN the January number of "Old and New," a magazine lately established under the auspices of the Unitarian Society, and conducted editorially by Rev. Edward Everett Hale, is an article on the "Perfection of Jesus," from the pen of Rev. James Freeman Clarke, which is interesting and valuable as presenting, in outline, the newest phase of the Theodore-Parker-Unitarian philosophy concerning the person, endowments, character, and work of our Lord Jesus Christ. We judge this latest phase of the Unitarian theory—upon which Mr. Clarke proposes to explain the history of Christ, eliminating, as it does, and as all the philosophies of that school have done before it, every superhuman and supernatural element from that history, and by which he expects, in his own language, "to reconcile the war between the Naturalists and Supernaturalists," like all its predecessors—to be partial and inadequate, as all *theories* in this matter must necessarily be; and the arguments by which he attempts to support his theory, fallacious and inconsistent; and we propose, in a brief paper, 1, to present his theory; 2, to notice its deficiencies, exposing the fallacy of his logic; and, 3, to restate the old argument, so often assailed by modern philosophies, yet without injury, each new attack foiled, but adding to its truth and strength and influence, "that Jesus, emasculated of his divinity, his Godhood, his Christhood, as Teacher, and King, and Savior of the human race, is, in no respects, the Christ of the Gospels, is not the object of Christian faith, is not the foundation and head of the Christian Church, and is no more qualified to constitute the Center of the spiritual creation, to give spiritual light and hope and life to the human race, than the moon, which shines by borrowed light alone, is qualified to take the place of the sun, as center of the Solar system, and source of physical light and health and life to the inhabitants of earth.

To avoid misrepresentations, and to place Mr. Clarke's theory clearly before the minds of such readers as may not have access to

the original paper, we will make copious extracts from his entire article, and, as far as is consistent with brevity, will allow him to speak for himself. He opens his paper with the following paragraph :

"That such a person as is described in the Gospels really existed, is admitted by all whose opinions are of any value ; such a person in the main. It is admitted that he was a Galilean peasant, of wonderful powers, spiritual, intellectual, and moral ; that he was able to rise to the highest point of spiritual and moral insight which man has ever attained ; that he went beyond the limitations of Judaism, so as to put the spirit above the letter, and find the essence of the law in love to God and to man ; and that his moral and spiritual personality was so deep and high as to constitute the original fountain out of which what we call Christianity took its rise."

Vale, vale, in eternum vale, Rénan, Strauss, et id omne genus !

Mr. Clarke makes the admission recorded, repudiating the mythical and legendary theories, as a matter of pure necessity, as being the safest, most tenable horn of the famous trilemma. He proceeds to say, in his second paragraph :

"For if we deny the existence of such a person as Jesus, we are obliged to assume that his character was an invention by some unknown person or persons, in the first or second century ; that the four Gospels were written by these persons, and this wonderful character placed in them, and made to act, and live, and speak, as we find him ; placed in connection with historical persons and events, and geographical localities, and this invention, undetected, was admitted as a reality, and that Christianity sprang out of it ; also, that by the middle of the second century, Churches were founded on the firm belief in the existence of this person, and contained those who pretended to have seen and talked with his first disciples."

As he again says toward the conclusion of his paper,

"The unquestioned and unquestionable facts, which are to be explained, are these: 1. There is such a phenomenon as Christian faith, which must have come from some source ; 2. There are such books as those of the New Testament, which must have had writers ; 3. There is such an institution as the Christian Church, which must have had an origin. Since all events must have a cause, these three events must have had a cause, and among all possible causes none has any probability or any evidence in its support but the personal character of Jesus Christ."

Mr. Clarke, having thus summarily, and, as we think, justly, re-manded all these pseudo-Christ, pseudo-philosophies, shades and ghosts, into nothingness, their appropriate sphere, next proceeds, with due caution and candor and modesty, to state the natural theory and the supernatural theory, or, more properly, the Christian creed, and placing these together in his logical crucible, after due process,

exhibits a new compound, labeled "The Perfection of Jesus." We proceed with our quotations :

"But now, in regard to Jesus Christ, we find two distinct and seemingly opposite views prevailing at the present time. The first is the traditional and general opinion that he was not like other men in his person, his endowments, his work, or his character; that his person was superhuman, his endowments supernatural, his work miraculous, and his character intellectually infallible and morally impeccable; that he was a miraculous creation; that he was divinely inspired and sent; that he did not sin, did not err, will never be superseded, and is the Master, Lord, King, of the human race forever. Hence it is assumed that he was not a man only and purely, but something more."

"The other view is that which has been becoming more and more popular since the days of Theodore Parker, not only in this country, but also in England, France, and Germany. It is, that Jesus was a man like all other men, born like other men, formed by circumstances as other men are formed, partaking of the errors of his age, not supernatural, but wholly natural; working no miracles, not infallible, but falling into error; not perfect morally; capable of being superseded and outgrown; and, in short, purely a man, like all other men."

"It will be observed that these two theories, so utterly opposite, nevertheless agree in one assumption. Both assume that perfection is unnatural to man; that man is necessarily imperfect, mentally and morally; that to be sinless is unnatural; that to see truth so clearly as to be certain of it, and not liable to be mistaken, is unnatural; in other words, that it is not natural for man to be good, and that a perfectly good man is necessarily a supernatural, or, what is thought the same thing, an unnatural being. Both classes agree that any such inward superiority as is ascribed to Jesus in the New Testament, implies a superhuman element. That is, again, both classes assume the essential poverty of human nature."

After this preliminary review of the situation, Mr. Clarke next introduces his own theory to our notice, as follows:

"But why may we not suppose that man's nature is higher than either party believes? What if man was made to be all Jesus was; what if human nature is not necessarily sinful, but otherwise; what if sin and error are unnatural, not natural—then it may follow that Jesus did all that he is claimed to have done in the Gospels; that he is all that he is described to have been, and yet instead of being at all unnatural, is a truer and more perfectly natural man than any other has been. Perhaps the greatness of Jesus may have been just here, that he was the *man of men*, the truest man, fulfilling the type of humanity. Perhaps the great lesson of his life is that human nature is not essentially evil, but good. Perhaps his mission was to show us one perfect specimen of the human race—one ideal pattern—one such as all are hereafter to become."

He then proceeds "to adduce some facts which show that there is nothing claimed in the Gospels for Christ which is inconsistent with the assumption of his being made in all respects like his brethren." Let us follow him in his examination and explanation of the

various facts of Christ's history, reserving our criticisms and our strictures upon his hypothesis until that hypothesis and the phenomena which it attempts to explain are all before us:

1. He rejects the narrative of Christ's miraculous birth "as legendary, not having the historic stamp of the rest of the Gospels: first, because it rests upon a different kind of evidence from the other facts of the life of Jesus; secondly, because it is impossible to know exactly what is intended by the narrative; thirdly, because, whatever it may mean, it can not imply that Jesus was not a man, made in all respects like his brethren." He claims for him "nothing exceptional in his nature or birth; his character resulted, like that of all other men, from these three factors: organization, education, free choice. He was *born* good; all the innate depraved tendencies from which others suffer were neutralized in him, and the infant Jesus began life with a nature like that of the primal man, liable, indeed, to sin, but capable of escaping sin."

2. As to his education, "it is only necessary to suppose that Jesus, as many children have done, grew up under influences peculiarly favorable to goodness— influences which tend, not to deprave, but to elevate. The natural, simple piety of his Nazarene home, the motherly love of Mary, the innocence of that country life, the influence of that beautiful natural scenery, the teachings of great prophetic masters whose works made his library, the expectation of the Messiah—these were the natural, *not* supernatural, influences which came to Jesus to make his education, and, to a genius like his, they were sufficient. Then there were also given divine influences—influences which come to all—to lift the soul of the child into a higher insight. It is only necessary to believe that Jesus received a higher measure of the Holy Spirit than most men; that he received a full and constant current of inspiration into his soul. Why doubt that God conferred on Jesus a moral and spiritual superiority to all other men, making him the spiritual master of the race, any more than we doubt that he conferred a mathematical gift on Newton, a poetic gift on Shakspeare, an artistic gift on Mozart or Raphael, making these masters in science, in poetry, in art!"

3. "To satisfy the faith of the Church we must accept the fact of the moral integrity of Jesus—that he was sinless, perfectly pure from the first, and all the way through. And this is said to be unnatural, superhuman. But why? Was man made to be a sinner, or to be free from sin? Did not God intend us to be sinless? Does not Orthodoxy confess that God made man naturally good? Does not our conscience condemn us for every act of sin? Jesus himself does not consider his own perfection as exceptional, but calls on all men to be like him in this matter: 'Be ye therefore perfect, as your Father in heaven is perfect.'"

The argument against the moral perfection of Jesus which his own system of philosophy would suggest—namely, the argument from experience—he disposes of by an illustration from nature:

"Does it follow, because the great multitude of any class of beings fail to reach the perfection of their class, that no one shall ever reach it? Is it not *more* probable that, amid this universal aspiration and tendency, one may at last arrive? Every plant has its typical form. Among ten thousand plants, not one, perhaps,

reaches it; but may not one somewhere arrive? The typical form of an elm-tree is of a perfectly symmetrical series of curves, etc.; do you say, because you have never found a perfect elm, that it is *unnatural* for an elm to be symmetrical? If an elm were at last to be discovered with every limb, branch, twig, and leaf in perfect proportion, you would not call it *unnatural*, but the final attainment and fulfillment of its nature. So the moral perfections of Jesus do not prove him unnatural and superhuman, but rather more human than any one else—the man God meant all men to be—the one who reveals to us what our nature really is, what it is one day to become.”

Of the intellectual infallibility of Jesus he thus speaks: “The knowledge of Jesus was limited; he was not sent to teach astronomy or geology, and so he did not know them. He even says that concerning the time of his own triumphant coming he is ignorant: ‘Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the Son, but the Father only.’ But he *made no mistakes* in those things which he professed to know. Concerning God, man, duty, immortality he made no mistakes; these were the things he saw by the intuition of his soul, so he *knew* them. And in this, also, he was not superhuman, for this is true of all men. All men are certain of that which they really know. A mathematician is perfectly sure of the laws of mathematics, so far as they have been discovered and verified. Whatever has been *verified* has been made certain beyond the possibility of error.”

4. “But the theory of the supernaturalist goes further, and declares that Jesus was divinely sent to be a teacher of the race, that he had a divine mission. Does not this make him unnatural, and separate him from human nature? Only if we disbelieve in Providence. Every man has his mission. Was the work of Wesley an accident? Did not Martin Luther have a mission? Are not such men *sent*? The mission of Jesus differed from that of other men in these two points: that it was the greatest work ever given man to do, and that he saw more clearly what it was than other men see theirs; he heard his great call more distinctly, and knew that God had chosen him, among all men, to be his true Christ.”

5. “But what shall we say concerning the miracles ascribed to Christ in the Gospels? Are not these unnatural and superhuman facts false to experience and opposed to the laws of nature, and so, essentially incredible? If I believed these wonderful works of Jesus to be *unnatural*, if I considered them as violations of law, then I should also say that they were essentially incredible. But, believing them, as I do, to be in perfect harmony with law, I consider them no more unnatural, no more opposed to the laws of nature, than the electric telegraph or the photograph would have seemed a hundred years ago. There are mysteries in nature, hidden from the foundation of the world, which are to be revealed hereafter, which would be to us as incredible as the miracles of Jesus seem now. These miracles of Jesus were not violations of law, but anticipations of great discoveries to come hereafter. Jesus did these things, not because he was superhuman, but because he was wholly and absolutely human—the ripe fruit of humanity, the fullness of manhood—and so having his soul *en rapport* with the laws of nature.”

6. “Now, this view of Christ is the very view taken in the New Testament. All the great qualities, powers, and functions of Jesus are not treated as monopolies, nor as his exclusive possession, but, in so many words, are spoken of as gifts which he came to impart to other men, therefore as essentially human. Indeed, only thus can he be considered as a mediator. All that he had, all that he was, he

communicated to his disciples, and, through them, to the world. . . . We have referred above to passages* of the New Testament which declare, *ipsissimis verbis*, that he meant his disciples to receive his power of working miracles, his oneness with God, his power of forgiving sin, his perfectness of character, his office of judge, his omniscience, his divine fullness, his honor and glory, his kingship and priesthood, and that they should share with him in his atoning work."

7. "And, now, in what sense shall we call Jesus our Lord and Master? Not in any sense which violates the perfect freedom of our thought and perfect conscientiousness of our actions. But he is our Lord and Master, because 'every one that is of the truth heareth his voice;' because he is the Good Shepherd who goes before the flock, and they follow him; because he is the Way, the Truth, and the Light; and because through him we come to the Father, and find God a Father and a Friend. No man's conscience or freedom is violated by taking a master, and receiving with trust his advice and instruction. All earnest souls seek and find their masters; and if, among all these masters, there has been sent one to be a master on the highest theme of all, a teacher in the realm of our highest life, it seems a grave mistake to assume toward him the attitude of a critic rather than that of a disciple."

In the very beginning of our strictures upon Mr. Clarke's theory, we wish utterly to disclaim any and every intention of even attempting to offer any better theory, or any theory at all, in explanation of the phenomena under consideration. It is our conviction that all theories and philosophies in this matter are doomed to utter failure; a conviction that is being deepened and strengthened almost every year, since almost every year some new philosopher appears with "the true philosopher's stone," destined, as he thinks, to solve all difficulties and clear up all mysteries, only to find his philosophy foolishness, and to serve as a monument of Christ's ever-increasing victories over the subtle foes of infidelity, while all the time the grand old facts remain, stubborn facts, simple and beautiful, the hope of the ages, unexplained and inexplicable by human reason, belonging as they do to the "secret things of God." The whole matter lies, as we reason, within the domain of faith, and not of philosophy; and the most fatal mistake man can commit is to permit his own conjectures, and hypotheses, and theories to usurp the place of the plain statements of God's Word.

"We have but faith, we can not know,
For knowledge is of things we see."

There are many difficulties in Revelation, which, we presume to say, the divine commentary itself could not render intelligible to

* John xiv, 12; xvii, 22; xx, 23; Matt. v, 48; 1 Cor. vi, 2; 1 John ii, 20; Eph. iii, 19; Luke x, 16; Rev. i, 6; Col. i, 24; John xx, 21.

human finite understandings, and which were, therefore, of necessity left unexplained on the sacred page. There is certainly an explanation of them, a philosophy in them, that belongs to God; the facts, supported as they are by ample testimony, address themselves not to reason, but to faith; these facts are ours, and it would surely be the highest folly to reject them because our philosophy can not apprehend them. We deem it the highest wisdom to accept Paul's simple declaration, "Great is the mystery of Godliness," as the ultimate truth in this whole controversy concerning the nature of our Lord.

"In religion, faith is philosophy; obedience, the perfection of science." "The earnest student of the 'record that God has given us of his Son,' as he reads and ponders, will say of Jesus, 'this is indeed the Son of Man, my near kinsman, and yet he is Immanuel, God with us; this is the Christ, the Son of God, and the Savior of the world. I can *believe* all this, and stake eternal issues upon it, but I can not *explain* it. I believe it because it is sustained by ample testimony, not because I am able to *classify*, and so bring into *scientific order*, all the facts and declarations that set forth the nature of One who, as the Word, was in the beginning with God, and who was God, but became flesh and dwelt among us, and who will, in the end, deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, and *himself be subject*, that God may be all in all.'"

But philosophy, in its pride, is slow to learn this lesson, and regards not the simple caveat of experience; and since Mr. Clarke has presented a new theory of the matter to the world, we propose, simply, to place his theory by the side of the facts which it would explain—our only available test of its truth and sufficiency.

I. It must be apparent, we think, even to Mr. Clarke himself, that the induction upon which he bases his theory is only partial, his interpretations of the examples induced often strained and one-sided, and his conclusions, therefore, inadequate and unsatisfactory. We need not, surely, remind him that it is no part of the true philosopher to construct his theory apart from the facts to be explained, then to sever these facts from all their natural connections, to twist them from their plain import in order to accommodate them to his theory, and either to reject as untrue, or wholly to ignore, all facts which can not, by either process, be made to fit to that theory. In this respect, however, let us say, in justice to Mr. Clarke, he has but followed the

example of his illustrious predecessor in Germany, and France, and in his own country. They have, one and all, formed their theories independently of the Gospels, and then rejected sometimes single facts in those Gospels, as the miraculous birth, or the resurrection, and sometimes even an entire Gospel, as several have done in regard to John's Gospel. This, let us repeat, is a most unphilosophical proceeding—and here we enter our first objection to Mr. Clarke's hypothesis, namely, an objection to his method. To philosophize after this fashion would indeed be within the reach of all; every man could be his own philosopher, and nothing would be able to present even the slightest difficulty to the humblest mind. All theories would be equally valuable, and alike valueless. This is Mr. Clarke's first and his fatal mistake, and, lying at the very foundation of his philosophy, vitiates all his subsequent conclusions. He summons upon the witness-stand Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and the writers of the Epistles; they are his own witnesses; he nowhere, in so many words, impeaches their integrity, their competency; he receives with implicit confidence all their statements, when those statements harmonize with his own preconceived theory, and help on his case; but either hears not, or passes by as unheard, whatever testimony goes against him. Now upon what principles can he justify such procedure? The witnesses are deposing concerning simple facts of history, themselves offering no explanation. Why accept their testimony in one case, and not in another? We shall make our objection plainer as we proceed with our investigation.

II. The miraculous birth. We can not but admire the nonchalance with which Mr. Clarke disposes of this, the first fact in the earthly history of our Lord. As a matter of course, he must either explain this or reject it; being unable to do the former, he chose to do the latter; for if he had received this as true, his whole theory would at once have come tumbling down about his ears. One objection is this: Why believe Luke's account of the miracles, of the transfiguration, of the resurrection, of the ascension, and reject his account of the birth? Are the former intrinsically less miraculous, more credible and conceivable, than the latter? Now, where are we to draw the line of distinction between the things to be received and the things to be rejected? Shall we believe a witness only in so far as his testimony accords with our own experience, our previous

conceptions, or our ability to explain the facts? This was the old argument against miracles, and has been a hundred times refuted. Mr. Clarke himself refutes it in his own illustration concerning the typical elm-tree. We can not, therefore, allow the miraculous birth of Christ to be disposed of in the easy, off-hand style in which he proposes; for, as the author of "*Ecce Deus*" has said, "The incarnation is the radical mystery in the life of Christ; it alone can account for, and is essential to a true interpretation of, the entire doctrine and phenomena associated with the name of Jesus Christ; it lies at the base of the Christian structure." To deny the miraculous birth is to assume the very point in controversy. Let us hear Mr. Clarke's reasons for rejecting the narrative: *a.* We can not reject the narrative, "because it is impossible to know exactly what is intended by it." This would be to adopt Mr. Clarke's method, and to receive his entire theory at once; for, evidently, his plan is to reject every thing which he can not understand. This, as before stated, is most unphilosophical. Upon this principle we should be compelled to reject nine-tenths of the entire history of Christ; yea, we should be compelled to disbelieve in our own triune existence, in the fact of our conception. Whence and when do we receive our own spirits? *b.* Nor can we reject the narrative, "because, whatever it may mean, it can not mean that Christ was not made in all respects like his brethren." This objection, as well as the preceding one, is clearly a "*petitio principii*;" for the text which Mr. Clarke incorporates into his objection (Hebrews ii, 17) certainly admits of a different interpretation, and the interpretation is the very point in question. *c.* We judge his first objection, "that the evidence in the case is more legendary, less historic, than that upon which the other facts of Christ's life rest, and different from it," even more unwarranted than the other two; it contains its own refutation. Surely we have the same witness deposing in the same simple manner; and we presume that to the ordinary reader not the slightest change is apparent, either in Luke's style or in the character of his statements, when he passes from the account of the miraculous birth to that of the subsequent miraculous events in Christ's life, such as the resurrection, the one fact being as intrinsically incomprehensible as the other. All three objections are only objections, and nothing more, and objections alone neither prove nor disprove any thing.

III. The miracles, it would seem, are a question by themselves. They have always been the stumbling-stone of infidel philosophers and skeptics; they have always constituted the issue, the battleground, between Christ and his enemies: for, until Mr. Clarke, they have admitted the inherent necessity of accepting the divinity of Jesus, all his high and sacred claims, if they acknowledged that he actually performed the wonderful works ascribed to him in the Gospels. Hence, as a class, they have rejected the miracles as legendary, mythical, their reasons being as various as the philosophers themselves.

According to Mr. Clarke, however, the miracles present no difficulties, are easily enough explained, are perfectly *natural*, and, therefore, not essentially incredible. He accepts them all, but denies that they prove Jesus any thing more than human. Jesus was simply a great, natural-born philosopher, the perfect man, having his soul *en rapport* with the laws of nature; by virtue of his perfect and typical humanity having an intuitive knowledge of all nature's laws, and possessing absolute control over them. His miracles are only anticipations of great discoveries to come hereafter, to be ranked along with the electric telegraph and the photograph. The power to work miracles is latent in the psychological nature of man, and Mr. Clarke predicts that in the course of time—after a thousand years, perhaps, for he leaves the time indefinite—men will have discovered the secret of Jesus' power, and walking on the water, curing the lame, and deaf, and blind by a word, and raising the dead by the voice, will be common enough—no more wonderful than electricity is to-day. Surely, dear reader, you and we—and Mr. Clarke, also—have been born at a most inauspicious hour! Why, let us lament, could we not have been born at that happiest period when any man shall be able to turn water into wine; to feed not only his own family, but the needy, hungering thousands with a few small loaves and little fishes—or, for that matter, with stones; to take a trip across the seas to Europe or round the world on foot; to keep his friends with him forever—for, dying, he could speak them to life again! *O, fortunati populi!* How cruel in Jesus to withhold his secret!

a. We deem our inferences from Mr. Clarke's theory just. The knowledge of and power over the electric telegraph and photography lie within the reach of any ordinary man. If eighteen hundred years

have already elapsed without revealing the secret of Jesus' power, how long does Mr. Clarke suppose it will be before some one man shall have attained the requisite ideal perfection to enable him to raise the dead? Judging the future progress of our race in this matter by the past, we greatly fear that Christ will have come a second time to judge the world before his secret is discovered. His miracles, to all intents and purposes, will be miracles still. The dead will hear *his* voice and come forth from their graves, and, we opine, not before.

b. Mr. Clarke says "miracles were the spontaneous outcome of the nature of Jesus, and were utterly refused by him when asked for as signs or proofs of truth." Jesus says, "Believe me for the very work's sake." He pointed to them as proofs of the truth of his words, the divinity of his mission: "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin; but now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father." Surely were the miracles the spontaneous outcome of the nature of Jesus—that is, of his *divine* nature—and were the seal of that divinity.

c. It is fundamental in our investigation to know in what sense Mr. Clarke uses the words miracle, perfection, nature, laws of nature, etc. He is certainly aware that all these terms have each more than one meaning*—a higher and a lower, a narrower and a wider meaning—and that, as a philosopher, it devolved upon him to define his terms at the very beginning of his paper. We infer that he uses these words in their higher acceptation, for he seems to be contemplating nature and miracles from *God's* stand-point, and not from the human stand-point. Now, we contend that, as we are on the earth, and not in heaven, this is unphilosophical. The question that concerns us is not, "How does God look at these things?" but "How must we look at them? What is our relation to them?" We presume that to God all things are natural—the creation of a universe, the deluge, the resurrection of the dead. Viewed from the divine stand-point, these are all natural, not miraculous, not violations of law, for in this highest sense law is the expression of God's will, and these, being acts of his will, can not be violations of law. So, we argue, Christ being divine, his wonderful works were to him not unnatural, but natural—the spontaneous outcome of his divine

*"Reign of Law," by the Duke of Argyll, chapters I and II.

nature. Mr. Clarke seems to use the word "unnatural" part of the time with reference to Christ's nature, and again with reference to the laws of the physical world. The question is, therefore, twofold: "Did Christ violate or rise above the laws of human nature?" and "Are miracles violations or suspensions of the laws of the material world?" He is sustaining two propositions: 1. Miracles are only manifestations of laws of nature yet undiscovered; and, 2. Christ, in his knowledge of and power over these laws, was only and purely human, neither violating nor transcending the laws of man's nature. Granting him his first proposition, which we can do by using the words nature and laws in their highest sense, we still call for proof of the second, for the miracles of Jesus imply not only knowledge of, but power to use, these yet undiscovered laws. Mr. Clarke doubtless *knows* the laws of gravitation, for have they not been *verified*? Would he attempt to walk upon the waters, or to hush the waves to rest by his voice?

IV. We find the same difficulties attending us in our investigation of the moral perfection of Jesus. Is it human, natural for man to be perfectly sinless, to commit no error? This question, too, we must consider from the human stand-point, and not from the divine; we are on the circumference, and not at the center. Now, how are we to decide this question? What must be our standard? To assume that Jesus is the standard would be to assume the point in question. Is the uniform experience of the world during six thousand years to be considered the standard? Are the representations of the Bible of any weight in deciding the question? Are the words of Jesus, whether direct or indirect, of any value? The question, it seems to us, is not, What did God design? What would he have us be and do? but, rather, What are the facts in the case? What does man choose to be and do? Is man's agency—his free-will and choice—of no consequence in deciding what is natural to him, what unnatural? God made man with a nature capable of being holy, and capable of sinning. Now, if man chooses to obey God's will, and be sinless, we call it natural. If he chooses to obey his own will, and be sinful, is it, therefore, less natural? Is it natural for a man to follow the line of one capacity, and unnatural to follow another? Sin and holiness are alike natural, and we conclude, therefore, that the question must be decided by another standard. "Be ye perfect, as your Father in

heaven is perfect." Does not this necessarily imply degrees of perfection? If it means that man shall fulfill the highest laws of his being as God fulfills the laws of his being, we may admit the possibility of man's being perfect. But to be perfect in the same sense in which God is perfect; perfect in knowledge, infallible; perfect in power, able to do all things by a mere act of volition; perfect in holiness, sinless, having no desire, no tendency to sin; would this be natural to man, even in the highest sense of the word natural? To be this, must he not be infinite? Must he not be God, as Christ was God? From this stand-point, again, we reach no conclusion. What, then, are the facts in the case? Man was created finite, capable of falling into error, into sin; the first created man sinned; so far as human history goes, all his descendants have sinned; the Bible represents the whole human race as lying in wickedness and sin; God sent his only-begotten Son to save the world, not from sinning, but from their sins; Jesus alone was without sin. Are we not justified in saying and believing that this freedom from sin, from moral imperfections, prove him different from the whole human race—that is, superhuman, Divine?

V. Mr. Clarke says there was nothing superhuman in the knowledge, in the intellectual infallibility of Jesus. Why? "For all men are certain of that which they really know"—that is, all men really know that which they really know. "The mathematician is perfectly sure of the laws of mathematics, so far as they have been discovered and verified." This argument seems to us lame in the extreme; we doubt if it satisfies even Mr. Clarke himself. To render the cases parallel, or similar in the least degree, would it not be necessary to assume that the truths which Mr. Clarke admits Jesus really knew were verified before he spoke them? The mathematician knows only after verification; Jesus knew before verification. Here lies the exact difference between the knowledge of Jesus and that of philosophers. Men know only after long study, and painful mistakes, and experiments, and verifications, nor even then always with absolute certainty, the verifications of one age overthrowing those of a preceding one; Jesus knew intuitively, antecedent to all experience, to all verification, and *always with absolute certainty*. Was he in this only human? Surely, "he spake as never man spake!"

VI. If for no other reason, we would pronounce Mr. Clarke's

theory inadequate and worthless, not merely because he rejects the miraculous birth, thus throwing away the key by which the whole of the subsequent marvelous life is to be opened up, but because he entirely and absolutely ignores the one great fact of that life, namely, *the sacrifice for sin*. We can not think that he passed this by through ignorance, or want of light concerning it; we dislike to think that the omission was intentional. Can he have really forgotten it, or is Mr. Clarke ignorant of the fact, that, after all, the "*atonement*" is the real point at issue between naturalists and supernaturalists? What must we think of the philosopher who, professing to reconcile the war between naturalists and supernaturalists, makes no mention of the real ground of difference? Does Mr. Clarke suppose that either party would care one whit whether Christ were divine or not, were it not that "he, with all authority in heaven and earth, declared himself the only Savior of the world, and commanded men to believe in him and accept him as the Son of the living God, and to yield him the obedience of their lives?" The *cross*, the *cross* is the true stumbling-stone, the rock of offense.

It is true Mr. Clarke speaks in general terms of Christ's mission, and alludes to his work as "the greatest work ever given man to do," but he nowhere tells us definitely and plainly what that mission and that work were. He alludes once to the atonement, but then in terms such as to imply that he placed a very low estimate upon its importance; certainly, he does not consider it Christ's work, his mission. We infer from his statements that the mission of Christ was "to fulfill the type of humanity;" "to show that human nature is not essentially evil, but good;" "to show us one perfect specimen of the human race, one ideal pattern;" "to be a teacher in the realm of our highest life." Now, how does this theory accord with the statements of both Christ and his Apostles concerning his mission? Has Mr. Clarke made a sufficiently comprehensive induction of those statements, and is his deduction fair and adequate? Was this, indeed, the mission of Christ, this only or chiefly? Here is the true issue between Mr. Clarke and the Gospels. Do supernaturalists deny that Christ was the ideal man, "the chiefest among ten thousand, and the one altogether lovely," the one spiritual Teacher and Master, "our great Ensamples?" Do they not call themselves his "disciples?" But they do not stop here, as Mr. Clarke would have them

do. This is much, but this is, by no means, first or all; for if there be one truth lying upon the very surface of the Gospels, and permeating their entire substance, stated oftener, with more clearness, with greater emphasis, and in more different forms, directly and indirectly, by Christ, and by all the writers of the New Testament, constituting, as it does, the very pith and marrow, not only of the Gospels, but of the entire New Testament, is it not that Christ came into the world, not to show us how good we were, or might be, but to die to save the human race from the fearful consequences of their sins? His name alone would teach us the one great truth—*Χριστος Ἰησους*, Anointed Savior.

But let us examine Mr. Clarke's witnesses on the matter: Matthew i, 21: "And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall *save* his people from their sins." Luke ii, 11: "For unto you is born this day in the city of David, a *Savior*, who is Christ the Lord." Luke xix, 10: "For the Son of man is come to seek and to *save* that which was lost." John iii, 16, 17: "For God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be *saved*." John i, 29: "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." John xii, 27: "Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour; but for this cause came I unto this hour." 1 John ii, 2: "And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." 1 John iii, 5: "And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin." 1 John iv, 10: "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." 1 Timothy i, 15: "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." Hebrews ix, 26: "But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Acts iv, 12: "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved," etc. Such passages speak a plain language; no comment is needed. This induction must suffice, for were we to collate all references to this subject, direct and indirect, it would be necessary

to transcribe a large portion of the New Testament; it is the key to the whole Bible—its alpha and omega. The Gospel which Christ delivered to his Apostles to proclaim, was the story, not of his ideal life, but of his suffering and death and resurrection; and this was to be preached, not as a model, but that "whosoever believeth and is baptized may be saved." They went every-where preaching that "Christ died for our sins, and rose again for our justification;" that the "*cross* is the power of God, and the wisdom of God;" that "Christ is our wisdom and sanctification and redemption;" that "he was bruised for our iniquities and wounded for our transgressions, and that by his stripes are we healed;" that "he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." Not till men had accepted him as their Savior, did they enjoin upon his disciples "to walk even as Christ walked." How are we to explain Mr. Clarke's total silence with regard to all these passages and others on the same subject?

VII. Not less incomplete and false is Mr. Clarke's statement of Christ's mediatorial work. "He is a mediator only in so far as he imparted his great qualities, powers, and functions, all that he had and all that he was, to his disciples, and through them to the world." Now, we aver that a mediator in any such sense is an impossibility. Do we ever thus apply the name mediator? Who is the mediator between parties at variance, between estranged nations? Does he confer his own powers, functions, qualities, upon them? There are, it is said, in these modern days, mediums, so-called, through whom the inhabitants of the unseen world communicate with sublunary mortals; the Apostles may be considered the mediums, the instruments through whom Christ sent to the world his blessed Gospel; but how Christ can be looked upon either as the mediator or medium of his own powers, qualities, functions, is a matter we are not able to comprehend. He is called the "one Mediator between God and man," "the Mediator of the new covenant," a function, we presume, not to be bestowed upon another.

a. Is it true either, in the first place, that he is represented as bestowing his own qualities, powers, endowments, upon men, or, in the second place, that he has actually so conferred them? We are aware that Mr. Clarke has induced many passages in support of his theory; one of his examples will suffice to show that his interpretations

and applications can not be sustained. "Did he suffer and die for mankind, and so make atonement for them? The Apostle Paul distinctly says that he himself was to fill up that which was behind in the afflictions of Christ." Yet Paul asks the Corinthians, "Was Paul crucified for you?" and nowhere represents himself as being the "propitiation for our sins;" he is only the minister, the instrument, of Christ, for our sakes.

b. Had Christ imparted his qualities, etc., would this have been human? Do men bestow their qualities, powers, endowments, on their fellow-men? Do they impart their inspiration—the Holy Spirit? One man instructs another how to use his own powers and endowments, and perform his own functions; gives him instruments to render these powers available, and bestows on him the fruits, the results, of his own powers; but the bestowment of a power, a quality, an endowment—is not this the gift of God, superhuman, supernatural?

c. The Apostles formed a class by themselves, and for reasons most evident. Christianity was to be established in the world; prejudice, superstition, religious and political opposition, to be overcome; Christ "must go to his Father;" the work must be committed to agents, and these agents must have credentials. The miracles of the Apostle were their credentials, proofs of their mission, to corroborate and confirm their message; they were all worked in Jesus's name; he gave the Apostles the Holy Spirit from on high, to guide them into all truth, and to bring to their remembrance whatsoever things he had spoken to them; "*God* bare witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to his own will, to that salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him."

d. Further, is it a matter of fact that such "gifts of the Holy Spirit" have been conferred by the Apostles on the world? If so, when were they lost, with whom did they cease, and why? We know of no one laying claim, in this modern age, to such powers, except His Holiness, Pope Pius IX; and the world, even the superstitious Catholic world, is about to deny his infallibility. Is Mr. Clarke prepared to acknowledge his claim?

VIII. "And now in what sense shall we call Jesus, Lord and Master?" Mr. Clarke answers, "In the same sense in which we call

Parker, or Emerson, or Mozart, or Comte, lords and masters, in their respective spheres." Is it possible to think that our relation to Christ is no higher, and involves no more sacred or important obligations, than our relations to these philosophers? Is the relation to Christ optional? May we receive or reject him with the same impunity as we do these men? When Christ said, "All authority is given me in heaven and in earth; he that accepteth me shall be saved, he that rejecteth me shall be damned;" did his words involve no more than similar words spoken by a Parker or an Emerson? I defy Mr. Clarke to think so. If he can give no higher reason for faith in Christ, than that "it is wiser to believe in the possibilities of human nature, in the concurrent facts of human testimony, that God's providence sends the world its great teachers and masters, and because faith is ever proving itself wiser than doubt, is the source of progress, the power that carries forward the world," then must we postpone indefinitely the day when even the majority of men will accept him, the day of the world's conversion and salvation; and admonish him that faith in Christ receives a most solemn sanction from the warnings, "That the day cometh when he shall judge the world in righteousness; shall pronounce the sentence that shall lift us to heaven or sink us to hell; when every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess that he is Christ the Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

IX. After this hasty review of this new attempt to explain away the divinity, the Godhood, of our Lord and Savior, Jesus the Christ—this attempt "to spoil us through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the elements of the world, and not after Christ," we must conclude still to "stand fast in the ancient faith;" "to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," namely, that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the Living God." We can not throw aside God's testimony to this truth, at Christ's baptism, at his transfiguration, at his resurrection, at his ascension: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him." We shall still hear Christ when he says, "Before Abraham was, I am;" "And now, O Father, glorify me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." We must still receive the testimony of Mr. Clarke's witnesses in its entirety. We must still believe that Christ is the "Word, who in the beginning

was with God, and who was God, and became flesh and dwelt among us ; Immanuel, God with us ; in whom dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily ; who is the head of all principality and power ; whom God hath appointed heir of all things ; by whom he also made the worlds, and without whom was not any thing made that was made ; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the Word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high, and ever liveth to make intercession for the sins of his people."

We are compelled to conclude that the Jesus of Mr. Clarke's theory will not explain the three unquestioned and unquestionable facts which he proposed to explain ; that his "ideal man" is not the Christ of the Gospels, is not the Object of Christian faith, is not the Rock of Ages on which the Christian Church is founded, against which not the philosophies of men, no, nor even the gates of the unseen world, shall prevail.

X. The supernaturalists are at war with the naturalists concerning the authenticity of the Gospels, the competency of the witnesses ; Mr. Clarke's war is with the Gospels themselves, his own witnesses. Is it too much to hope that they will survive the thrusts of this "foe in the camp"? We esteem Christ's divinity the living issue of the present age, as it is of every age. Christ made it the issue in his own age : "Whom do men say that I the Son of man am? What think ye of Christ ; whose son is he?" His question has been thrilling through all the years since first spoken ; has been the sword dividing families, societies, and nations asunder ; has been answered in tears, and agony, and blood ; has civilized the world. It is the life and soul of all modern thought and controversy. The new answer given, this newest phase of the controversy, this newest attitude which men have assumed toward Christ, is all the more dangerous because seemingly so fair and candid. It is as wise as the serpent, and as harmful ; it is, indeed, the same old serpent, in his most alluring form and fascinating colors—the fiery, flying serpent. It extols Christ to the very heavens, and paints his character in most glowing colors ; its description of him is enthusiastic, romantic, fascinating ; it grants to him, seemingly, all our hearts could desire—moral perfection, intellectual infallibility, miraculous power—only to conceal

and deny the real point at issue, on which hang all our hopes—his divinity. "The seed of the woman shall yet bruise the serpent's head!"

In conclusion, we feel justified in bringing this theory to the notice of our readers, on account of its very subtlety, and because "it is evident that the great battle of Christianity in our day is to be fought over the question of the divine origin of the Scriptures, and the divine nature of Christ. Modern skepticism has leveled its strongest batteries on these points. The Church need not fear to accept this new battle offered. True, it strikes at the most vital part of our Christianity, but for that very reason it must fail. Christianity can afford to lean on the character of her Divine Founder, and to witness without alarm the attacks of her enemies on the Rock of Ages." *

Who so well prepared to engage in this conflict, dear readers, as those who, having thrown aside all the trammeling burdens of creeds, and theologies, and religious philosophies, and the traditions of men, have planted themselves upon the simple truth that "Jesus is the Christ of God, the Savior of the world," and that our whole religious duty is comprised in the "acceptance of this Christ, love toward him, and obedience to his commandments"—this, and nothing less or more? On these is to fall the heat and burden of the day. "Blessed be God, who shall give them the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

* "The Christ of the Gospels," by Principal Tulloch, D. D., introduction, p. 29.

LITERARY NOTICES.

HOME LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

- I.—*Christianity and Greek Philosophy; or, The Relation between Spontaneous and Reflective Thought in Greece and the Positive Teaching of Christ and his Apostles.* By B. F. COCKER, D. D. New York: Harper & Brothers. 8vo. pp. 531. 1870.

THE investigations of Bunsen, Rawlinson, Max Müller, and others, have awakened much interest among scholars concerning the relation of Christianity to the older religions of the world. The subject is surely one of very great importance, and needs to be discussed with the utmost candor. Truth has never any thing to fear from error in full and free discussion. Hence we do not fear the result of this investigation, and hope that it will be pressed as far as it possibly can be. Professor Cocker thus states the purpose of his volume:

"In preparing the present volume the writer has been actuated by a conscientious desire to deepen and vivify our faith in the Christian system of truth, by showing that it does not rest solely on a special class of facts, but upon all the facts of nature and humanity; that its authority does not repose alone on the peculiar and supernatural events which transpired in Palestine, but also on the still broader foundation of the ideas and laws of the reason, and the common wants and instinctive yearnings of the human heart. It is his conviction that the course and constitution of nature, the whole current of history, and the entire development of human thought in the ages anterior to the advent of the Redeemer center in, and can only be interpreted by, the purpose of redemption."

He further declares that "the method, hitherto most prevalent, of treating the history of human thought as a series of isolated, disconnected, and lawless movements, without unity and purpose, and the practice of denouncing the religions and practices of the ancient world as inventions of Satanic mischief, or as the capricious and wicked efforts of humanity to relegate itself from the bonds of allegiance to the One Supreme Lord and Lawgiver, have, in his judgment, been prejudicial to the interest of all truth, and especially injurious to the cause of Christianity."

This is surely a grave charge, and, if well sustained, should certainly lead to a different method of writing history. We doubt, however, the first part of the Professor's statement. We do not think "the method hitherto most prevalent" has been to treat "the history of human thought as a series

of isolated, disconnected, and lawless movements, without unity and purpose." It may be that men have not hitherto sufficiently understood "that the necessary ideas and laws of the reason and the native instincts of the human heart, originally implanted by God, are the primal and germinal forces of history, and that these have been developed under conditions which were first ordained, and have been continually supervised by the providence of God;" and it *may* be, also, that this "central and unifying thought" of Professor Cocker's volume is not true. At any rate, this is just the question to be decided, and yet it is the one that is assumed to be true in the very beginning of the discussion. We respectfully submit that this is scarcely fair dealing with the facts of history. Almost any proposition can be proved in this way. For example, let us assume that "these primal and germinal forces of history" have evolved the Mohammedan religion. Would it not be easy enough to establish this assumption by Professor Cocker's method? It is not difficult to put several facts together and rush to any conclusion we desire, if it is first *assumed* that the connection between these facts is "ordained and continually supervised by the providence of God."

There is certainly much truth in Professor Cocker's volume, and the ability displayed is of a very high order. Still, we think his logic will eventually lead to Positivism, though clearly intended to be a refutation of that philosophy.

Three chapters of the book are devoted to a discussion of the Unknown God—is God cognizable by reason? The question started in this discussion is answered in the affirmative, and this view of the matter is supported by three propositions, as follows:

- I. "The idea of God is a common phenomenon of the universal human intelligence.
- II. "The idea of God, in its completeness, is a simple, immediate, and direct intuition of the reason alone, independent of all experience and all knowledge of the external world.
- III. "The universe presents to the human mind an aggregation and history of phenomena which demand the idea of a God—a self-existent, intelligent, personal, righteous First Cause—as its adequate explanation."

We think the truth of the first of these propositions may be fairly questioned. But, even allowing that it is universally true, the phenomenon may, perhaps, be accounted for without admitting Professor Cocker's conclusion. It is altogether easier to make out that this phenomenon is the result of tradition than that it originates in human reason.

The second proposition is a *petitio principii*—it assumes the very point in controversy. If the "idea of God, in its completeness, is a simple, direct, and immediate intuition of the reason alone, independent of all experience and all knowledge of the external world," of course it is not suggested in any other way, and consequently the necessity which has been supposed to exist for a revelation of this idea is all imaginary. Furthermore, we do not

see how the third proposition can be of any benefit in the discussion if the second is true. Why should we be concerned about what the universe presents to the human mind, if the idea of God is "an immediate intuition of the reason alone?" Surely, the reason will not descend from its high position of direct communion with God in order to be convinced of his existence by "an aggregation and history of phenomena" in the universe.

The truth is, we can scarcely be accounted competent judges upon a subject of this kind. We are *already* in possession of the idea of a God; hence it is exceedingly easy for us to *imagine*, with this idea in our minds, that human reason would furnish us with it. But this we have no right to do. We must first place ourselves in the position of those who have to *find out* what we *already know* before we can fully understand the difficulties in our way. A great deal of sophistical reasoning has been introduced into our theological polemics on this subject. It is readily granted, when the idea of a God is once in our minds, that human reason and the analogies of nature go far to establish it there, but that it were possible to obtain the idea without a *revelation* is, to say the least, very questionable. Hence Paul, in the first chapter of Romans, bases his argument for a *divine revelation* on the grounds that the people, through their sinful lusts, had lost the idea of their Creator.

It is confessedly a difficult task to treat the phenomena of history according to any theory, no matter what it is. There are so many conditions of human life unknown to the historian that he must necessarily base his conclusions upon only a *partial* induction of facts. Were it possible to take in the whole range of human action and human experience, it would be far easier to make out something definite and certain. But, as we can not have this comprehensive view, we should be very careful how we press any theory that offers to explain phenomena with which we are very imperfectly acquainted.

Professor Cocker's volume is valuable because it awakens thought and challenges investigation upon an important subject; and, while we are compelled to dissent from much that is contained in it, we take pleasure in bearing testimony to its reverent spirit, its candor, and its earnest plea for the truth of the Christian religion. It is worthy to be carefully studied by every one who wishes to be intelligently informed on one of the greatest questions of the present age.

2.—*Miracles, Past and Present.* By WILLIAM MOUNTFORD. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 12mo. pp. 501. 1870.

WE do not know who Mr. Mountford is, but we do know that he has written a very able book. The importance of the subject he has selected, can scarcely be overestimated. There was a time when miracles were consid-

ered as one of the pillars of the Christian faith. Has the time now come when this pillar can be dispensed with? Are we to follow the destructive school of criticism, and eliminate entirely the supernatural out of the Christian religion? or shall we still contend for the old doctrine that miracles and Christianity must stand or fall together? This is the issue which Mr. Mountford makes, and, unless we are greatly mistaken, the rationalists will feel the force of his blows.

The following language furnishes us with the key to Mr. Mountford's book:

"The Church of the future will be, of course, in some degree, a continuation of the past; but it will specially be, earlier or later, a revival of the earlier Church, at its best. And this book has been written and is published under the persuasion that the voice of the early Church is as distinctly audible to-day as it ever was; and that, as far merely as the miraculous is concerned, the Scripture, when fairly considered, at this present time, are as credible as they ever were."

Had Mr. Mountford been satisfied to develop what is contained in this statement, we should have been better satisfied with him. But assuming, as he does, that the modern Church must be identical with the Primitive in *some* things, he reaches the conclusion that there must be identity in *all* things. This, of course, is fallacious reasoning, but is precisely the way in which he seeks to establish the fact that *miracles are still a part of the inheritance of the Church*. We do not now attempt to set aside his conclusion. We wish only to suggest that his method of reaching it leads us to suspect that he was entirely too anxious to help the cause of the Spiritualists, a class with whom he is most likely religiously connected. This defect, however, does not destroy our interest in the book as a whole. The author has written so much that is manifestly good and timely, that we are disposed to forgive any apparent outcroppings of a system of religion founded on an extreme view of supernatural agency.

The chapter denominated "A Miracle Defined," is of unusual interest, and shows that the author has at least studied the subject. He first states what is abundantly evident to any one who has given the matter any attention, that there is no harmony among theologians in defining what a miracle is, and then by a careful analysis of many passages of Scripture he arrives at the following conclusions:

I. "A miracle is a 'sign' that men are vitally connected with a sphere which is wider than what is commonly called 'nature,' and which transcends it.

II. "A miracle is a 'sign' as to individuals, and sometimes as to communities, of an increase in sensibility as to influence from the spiritual world.

III. "A miracle is a 'sign' that in the persons through whom it is wrought, there is a state of openness toward the spiritual world, through which, more or less effectually, they may be receptive of spiritual suggestions, prophetic and doctrinal; which suggestions, however, like the miracle itself, may possibly be not from above.

IV. "A miracle of magnitude and beneficence would seem to create a high presumption, and to be a 'sign' as to the goodness, and therefore as to the reliability, of the person through whom it is wrought."

V. "A miracle or sign is a possibility of the present day, and from quarters both good and bad.

VI. "As to the significance of miracles, or as to signs given or coming from the spiritual world, men ordinarily may judge of themselves, and always they may learn from the Holy Spirit, the monitions of which will never fail while there are two or three disciples to gather together truly, in the name of Jesus Christ."

These conclusions should not be disposed of hastily. They are full of the seeds of things, in any just comprehension of supernatural influence.

Without entering upon a critical examination of this definition of a miracle, there is one point the author makes to which we wish to call attention. We refer to his statement that a miracle may "possibly be not from above."

If there is any thing which he makes clear, and places beyond controversy, it is that miracles may be wrought by Satanic influence. He says :

"The field of the miraculous is wider and more mysterious than might seem to be supposed by some people, and even by many divines. According to the Scriptures, miracles, and of more kinds than one, a man might work, and yet be no Christian. And, as it would seem, a man might even work miracles in the name of Christ, and possibly by even the virtue of that name, and yet truly himself not be a Christian. 'Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew ye: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.' That is a warning for persons about themselves, as channels for the miraculous. And now let a caution be considered, as to the origin and laws of marvelous manifestations. Because there were going about many false prophets, that is, many persons who were liable to be inspired with bad spirits, St. John, in his first Epistle, gives what would be a test, for at least the people individually to whom he wrote. 'Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the spirit of God; every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God.'"

This position is further strengthened by reference to such passages of Scripture as enjoined upon the first Christians the duty of trying the spirits in order to determine their character, before confidence is placed in them; and then, after some remarks concerning the ignorance of many with reference to the field of thought marked out, he gives us this suggestive paragraph :

"And truly the world, intellectual and spiritual, must be alive with laws, powers, and agencies, in a thousand ways, as to which we mortals can know nothing whatever, but of which for importance, and nearness, we may conjecture something from the manner in which the outer material world has revealed itself to eyes, fitted with telescope and microscope. In the fourteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Corinthians there is a glimpse of what the souls of men are capable of manifesting as to prophecy, and as to the discovery of the secrets of the heart, and as to speech in unknown tongues of men, and, it may be, of angels. But it was the doctrine of Paul, that than all such marvels as these, charity is far better evidence as to the operation of the Spirit. By these remarks there is implied another spiritual world than what some theologians suppose; but it is not, therefore, the less certain or Scriptural."

We would like to follow Mr. Mountford still further in his very extraordinary arguments in defense of miracles, but our space will not permit at present. We can only say that the book will repay a careful reading to all

who are earnest enough, with reference to the Christian religion, to seek for the strongest evidences of its truth. The book is not a mere discussion of philosophical theories, but an able exegesis of such passages of Scripture as relate to the subject under consideration. In every case a final appeal is made to the Word of God, and though the interpretations may not always be correct, still it is refreshing in these days, when thin sentimentalisms and rationalistic platitudes are relied on to settle the great question of man's eternal destiny, to read a book so full of quotations from the Holy Bible.

The author's style is as remarkable for a want of finish as his arguments are for their clearness and strength. He is evidently not in the habit of writing much. His sentences are frequently heavy and poorly constructed, though they can be well enough understood. We do not think we have ever read an author who has so much need for the little word "as" as the writer of "Miracles, Past and Present."

3.—*Life of Elder John Smith, with some Account of the Rise and Progress of the Current Reformation.* By JOHN AUGUSTUS WILLIAMS. Cincinnati: R. W. Carroll & Co. 8vo. pp. 578. 1870.

THE history of human progress is to be found in the lives of the world's moral heroes. We do not undervalue physical courage. When properly directed, it is a worthy element in any man's character; but moral heroism is the highest expression of a noble manhood. To devote one's self to the propagation of the right, in defiance of all opposition, and in the sacrifice of social ties and worldly aggrandizement, is always a proof of a strong and earnest character. This is especially true when all this is done in the interest of religious principles. Such a man, in an eminent degree, was Elder John Smith, the subject of the very elegantly printed volume before us.

The life of this extraordinary man furnishes the thread around which President Williams has woven much of the religious history of Kentucky for the last fifty years; and this fact gives the volume a permanent place in our literature which it would otherwise have failed to secure. Personal reminiscences, however interesting to the friends of the hero, very largely lose their charm to readers who are not immediately connected in some way with the actor. Hence, a biography of any great value must always connect the subject with the age in which he lived. In this respect President Williams has been eminently successful; while he has never lost sight of his hero, he has constantly made him tell the story of that great religious movement, the influence of which has so sensibly modified the religious condition of Kentucky.

Not the least interesting feature of the volume is its vivid pictures of the religious and social life of the people with whom Elder Smith was associated in the early part of his career. It is doubtful whether many Baptists

of the present day are aware of the extraordinary changes that have taken place among them within the last fifty years. The sturdy Calvinism of the council at Lulbegrud would find few advocates, we presume, in the Baptist ranks of to-day, while in many other particulars the difference between then and now is just as great. In fact, the influence of the Reformation, as pleaded by Alexander Campbell, Elder Smith, and their co-laborers, has not been confined to the Churches which accept fully all its cardinal principles; but it has in many ways wrought changes in the various religious denominations of the country, especially those in the West and South. No one can impartially read President Williams's volume without admitting the truth of this statement. Hence, while it is readily granted that the difference between Baptists and Disciples is still considerable, it is by no means as great as it was in the earlier days of the current Reformation. And we think this is equally true when the Disciples are compared with almost all other religious people. There has evidently been a steady advance from the crude theories and unlettered superstitions of the past, to more consistent and rational views of the Christian religion. Who will deny that this growth is mainly due to the Reformation as advocated by the Disciples? If any one is skeptical on the subject, we earnestly recommend him to carefully read the *Life of Elder John Smith*.

The general style of the book is excellent. There is no effort at fine writing. The narrative is allowed to flow uninterruptedly along. Wherever it is practicable, Elder Smith is permitted to tell his own story, and in his own language, as any one can see, who was acquainted with his style. In fact, one of the interesting features of the work is its wonderful simplicity. There is nothing stilted, while, at the same time, there is seldom any thing that is inelegant. We say *seldom*, because there are some things, both of style and matter, we would gladly see expunged. We do not think that even wit will excuse bad grammar, or elevate a coarse thing to the dignity of biographical material. We are aware that it will be said that Elder Smith was a plain man, but plainness is surely not a synonym for vulgarity; and even if it were, it is doubtful whether any biographer should illustrate it by giving us specimens in his book.

There is one feature of the book that is worthy of special mention. There is no effort on the part of President Williams to bring himself into notice. In fact, the attention of the reader is at once so entirely fixed upon the subject of the book, that the author of it is scarcely ever remembered. This is a high quality in biography, and it is prominent in an eminent degree in the *Life of Elder Smith*. President Williams has evidently performed his task with a conscientious regard for the reputation of the subject of his biography, and has left his own reputation to take care of itself. This is as it should be, and we take pleasure in commending President Williams for it.

- 4.—*Debate on the Action, Design, and Subject of Baptism, Work of the Holy Spirit, Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and Human Creeds*, between CLARK BRADEN, President of Southern Illinois College, and G. W. HUGHEY, Presiding Elder of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Cairo District. Cincinnati: Franklin & Rice. 8vo. pp. 687. 1870.

WE have already had occasion to enter our protest against the publication of so many debates. Indeed, we do not see the necessity for holding these debates; but if others think differently, we must insist that the debates shall end with their delivery. By this, we do not mean that any oral discussions should never be published. It may be proper sometimes, especially in the beginning of any great religious movement, to print the speeches of disputants upon the vital questions at issue. But surely this thing should not go on forever, and especially when every debate is little more than a repetition of arguments that have already been made a thousand and one times.

Oral discussions must, of necessity, be unsatisfactory. If the disputants should even approach the domain of exhaustive criticism, it must at once be obvious to every one, that their work can only be imperfectly accomplished. No man can hope, in the heat of oral controversy, to be sufficiently guarded in his expressions, and careful in his analysis, as to do justice where calm and deliberate thought and the most patient investigation are required. Hence, while oral discussions may sometimes be well enough for the immediate communities where they are held, as a general rule, they can be of little service when published in book form.

The volume before us is not excepted in these remarks. And yet this discussion between Messrs. Braden and Hughey is considerably above works of its class. Both men seem to be well at home in the management of their cause, and evince undoubted ability in the arrangement and presentation of their respective arguments. Some new matter also is introduced, that is, such as does not appear in other published discussions. This is particularly noticeable in the discussion on the action of baptism and the polity of the Methodist Episcopal Church. On both of these subjects President Braden has shown commendable skill, and fairly out-generated his able antagonist.

But it is on the design and subject of baptism that Elder Hughey shows his greatest weakness and President Braden his greatest strength. We do not think the discussion on the subject of human creeds is able on either side, as there seems to be a lack of a just perception of the real question at issue.

In general terms we do not hesitate to say that the debate is able, and to those who have a taste for such reading, it will be found interesting and instructive. Still, there are some very grave defects, one of which we can not refrain from pointing out, as it may serve a good purpose to those who

in the future may think it necessary to publish debates. We refer to the very apparent effort on the part of both disputants to show off their learning. Now, it ought to be assumed, without discussion, that men who propose to debate the questions at issue in this book are scholars. This much, we presume, should be granted on the grounds that they would attempt the enlightenment of the public on such grave matters. Hence, we do not see the necessity which calls for such a constant parade of erudition which every reader would be willing to take for granted. It seems to us that a popular oral discussion should be conducted, as far as possible, in the vernacular of the people who are the hearers. At least this seems to be the only way in which the people can be profited, and this rule strictly observed, would, in a measure, overcome our objections to such discussions. But instead of this we have the changes run from Syriac to Coptic, and from Hebrew to Greek and Latin, all of which would be well enough in a calmly written, critical essay, but it is sadly out of place in oral discussions intended for popular consumption.

We would like to notice in detail some of the arguments in this debate; but this would require more space than we can at present command. We propose, however, at some future time, to take this, with other discussions which have recently appeared, and attempt to give our readers a discriminating judgment concerning all the points in the controversy. Till then, we must leave Messrs. Braden and Hughey in the hands of the public, for whose benefit they claim to have held their debate.

5.—*The Primeval World of Hebrew Tradition.* By FREDERIC HENRY HEDGE. Boston: Roberts & Brothers. 16mo. pp. 283. 1870.

IF for no other reason, this volume is valuable as a literary curiosity. It is difficult to decide whether the book was written as a serious effort to explain the drama of creation, etc., or as a sort of burlesque upon those who have recently been so busy in this field of investigation. At any rate, we can regard it as only a literary joke, if we retain our respect for the talents and learning of the distinguished author. For, surely no one can, for a moment, understand how a man of intelligence and moral seriousness can entertain the views expressed in Dr. Hedge's volume.

The book contains twelve discourses, in which we have many things said concerning the primeval world, without throwing much additional light upon that rather obscure page of history. The first discourse is entitled "The World a Divine Creation;" and yet, singular enough, we are at last informed that the world never was created. We are told that "God in creating did not bring into being a new substance foreign to himself;" that "the material creation has no independent existence," but exists "only in God

and in us." This of course settles the question, and makes matter a part of God himself, and as self-existent as he is. We are curious to know, in this view of the case, how the world could be divinely created.

The second chapter is devoted to "Man in the Image of God," and at once opens up the question of the Darwinian philosophy. Was man originally an ape? Evidently Dr. Hedge takes no pleasure in the affirmative of this question, and yet does not see his way clearly in the negative. He would himself like to be excluded from the apish races. Hence, it is possible that the Darwinian theory is partly true and partly false; that *some* may have sprung from apes, and *some* not. That is, the lower orders of men are from apes, and are steadily advancing higher, while the historic races are coming down. They meet on the way, and are at once recognized by each other as brothers in the great family of man.

We are next introduced to "Man in Paradise;" and though the whole story is treated as an allegory, we have the Garden of Eden distinctly located at the head-waters of the Euphrates, where man's history began, from which is to be evolved the future Eden, where, it is more than hinted, many laws of our present political economy will be changed.

The author shines in his lecture on "The Brute Creation." Here he frees himself from all theological embarrassment, cuts loose from all scientific theories, and gives us what must ever be regarded as a "settler" on this question. Who can wonder at the author's sympathetic appeals on behalf of the "brute creation," when it is gravely asserted that the Spirit of God "dwells in them," and when it is gently intimated that no inconsiderable portion of the human race is closely related to them? We do not know whether the Doctor is a vegetarian or not, but we respectfully suggest that we think him capable of writing an eloquent book on the barbarism in the use of animal food.

"Paradise Lost" was not a very great loss after all, since Paradise itself had no real existence.

We pass over the concluding chapters with the simple remark that the joke increases as we advance toward the end of the book. It may be that "fact is stranger than fiction," but there are some fictions that are surely strange enough. If the Rationalistic view of the creation and primitive society be correct, then is the fiction of the Bible altogether more wonderful than any truth that was ever written.

6.—*The Life of our Lord.* By Rev. WILLIAM HANNA, D. D., LL. D. In six volumes. 12mo. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1870.

WE have already called attention to the first volume of this work, "The Earlier Years of our Lord's Life on Earth." We now have "The Ministry

in Galilee," "The Close of the Ministry," "The Passion Week," "The Last Day of our Lord's Passion," and "The Forty Days after the Resurrection."

It is evident that the matter of these volumes was delivered in the form of lectures. This, however, does not detract from the work as a whole; at least it does not when we consider the obvious design of the author. Dr. Hanna has not attempted to write a life of Jesus in detail; hence his work is comparatively free from discussions of the knotty points which usually occupy much space with writers on the same subject; still he has not avoided any important difficulty when it was properly in his way.

Another feature of the work will commend it for popular use. It is free from annoying foot-notes and burdensome erudition. He selects the particular features he wishes to bring out, and goes right straight forward with his work. He is evidently a true artist. It is the picture he wishes to exhibit, not the tools by which it was made.

The style is sometimes a little involved, owing, doubtless, to the unpardonable length of some of the sentences. Bating this defect, the style is one of the charms of the work. There is so much freshness, vigor, and even beauty, that it is impossible to read far without feeling that we are following a master in the art of composition. We present the following paragraphs, not only as a good illustration of the style of the work, but as highly suggestive of the wonderful mission upon which the Apostles were sent:

"Can any one read over and even partially enter into the meaning of those words which Jesus spoke to his Apostles when sending them for the first time from his side—a season when there was so little material out of which any rational conjecture could be formed as to his future or theirs, or the future of any school or sect, or institution that he and they might found—and not be convinced that open as day lay all that future to him who here, as elsewhere in so many of his most important discourses, sets forth in a series of perspectives—mixing with and melting into each other—the whole history of his Church in all its trials and conflicts from the beginning even to the end? But a greater than a prophet is here—one who speaks of men being hated, persecuted, scourged, and put to death for his name's sake, as if there were nothing in any wise unreasonable or unnatural in it; one who would have all men come to him, and who asks of all who come, love, obedience, and sacrifice, such as but one being has a right to ask, even he who has redeemed us to God by his blood; whose right over all we are and have, and can do, is supreme, unchallengeable, unchangeable; whose by every tie we are, and whom, by the mightiest of all obligations, we are bound to love and serve.

"The sight must have been a very extraordinary one, of the Apostles setting off two by two from their Master's side, passing with such eagerness and haste through the towns and villages, preaching and working miracles. To hear one man preach as Jesus did, to see one man confirm his word by doing such wonderful works, filled the whole community with wonder. To what a higher pitch must that wonder have been raised when they saw others commissioned by him, endowed by him, not only preaching as he did, but healing, too, all manner of disease! True, the circle was a small one to whom such special powers were delegated; but half a year or so afterward, as if to teach that it was not to the twelve alone—to those holding the high office of the apostolate—that Jesus was prepared to grant such a commission, he sent out a band of seventy men, embracing, we are inclined to be-

lieve, almost the entire body of his professed disciples in the north who were of the age and had the strength to execute such a task; addressing them in almost the same terms, imposing on them the same duties, and clothing them with the same prerogatives, clearly manifesting by his employment of so large a number of his ordinary disciples that it was not his purpose that the dissemination of the knowledge of his name should be confined to any one small and peculiarly endowed body of men."

7—*Free Russia*. By WILLIAM HEPWORTH DIXON, author of "Free America," "Her Majesty's Tower," etc. New York: Harper & Brothers. 8vo. pp. 359. 1870.

MR. DIXON could scarcely write a dull book if he were to try. His style is so vivacious that any effort of his to be stupid would most likely become entertaining reading. His present work is in his best vein. Having made, in previous years, two journeys to the country he describes, he is well prepared for intelligent observations, when he sets out in earnest on his extensive tour "from the Polar Sea to the Ural Mountains, from the mouth of the Vistula to the straits of Yeni Kale, including visits to the four holy shrines of Solovetsk, Pechersk, St. George, and Troitsa."

What a change has taken place in Russia since the Crimean war! No people in Europe have, within the same period, made greater progress than those of the great Slavonic Empire. Who would have thought that the empire of Nicholas could have been with any degree of truth called *free* Russia during the reign of his son! Surely the word progress is not inappropriately used when applied to the Russian Empire for the last few years.

We are, however, not quite as enthusiastic as Mr. Dixon. We think that much yet remains to be accomplished before the word *free* can be properly used as descriptive of Russia. We are hopeful, but are content to wait even many years yet to see our hope realized.

Mr. Dixon gives many lively pictures of the people, has considerable to say about pilgrims, monks, parish priests, village justice, patriarchal life, beggars, tramps, sectaries, Kozaks, Kalmuks, Kirghiz, workmen's artelles, burgher rights, division of land, students' revolts, soldiers' grievances, etc.; all of which is said in the sprightliest style, and in the best of humor.

The following, in reference to the popular Church, at once gives us an inside view of the present state of Russian society:

"It is not yet understood in England and America that a popular Church exists in Russia side by side with the official Church. It is not yet suspected in England and America that this popular Church exists in sleepless enmity and eternal conflict with this official Church. Yet in this fact of facts lies the key to every estimate of Russian progress and Russian power.

"This popular Church consists of the Old Believers; men who reject the pretended 'reforms' of Patriarch Nikon, and follow their fathers in observing the more ancient rite. 'You will find in our country,' said to me a priest of this ancient faith, 'a Church of Byzantine and a Church of Bethlehem; a new voice and an old voice; a system framed by man, and a Gospel given by God.'

"No one has ever yet counted the men who stand aloof from the State Church as Old Believers. By the Government they have been sometimes treated in a vague and foolish way as dissenters; though the Governments have never had the courage to count them as dissenters in the official papers. Known to be sources of weakness in the empire, they have been hated, feared, cajoled, maligned; observed by spies, arrested by police, entreated by ministers—every thing but counted—for the Government have not dared to face the truths which counting these Old Believers would reveal. A wiser spirit rules to-day in the Winter Palace; and this great question—greatest of all domestic questions—is being studied under all its lights. Already it is felt in governing circles—let the monks say what they will—that nothing can be safely done in Russia, unless these Old Believers like it. Every new suggestion laid before the Council of Ministers is met—I have been told—by the query, 'What will the Old Believers say?'"

The number of Old Believers in the empire is estimated as high as seventeen millions, and this at once suggests the amount of influence which this class is likely to exert on the future of Russia. Mr. Dixon ascertained that the Bible was read in tens of thousands of pious homes, and that it is regarded as the main stay, not of religion only, but of national life.

8.—*American Political Economy; including Strictures on the Management of the Currency and the Finances since 1861, with a Chart showing the Fluctuations in the Price of Gold.* By FRANCIS BOWEN, *Alford Professor of Natural Religion, Moral Philosophy, and Civil Polity, in Harvard College.* New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 8vo. pp. 495. 1870.

PERHAPS the difference between theory and practice is nowhere more strikingly illustrated than in what is called Political Economy. Theorists are ever ready to show us the way to individual fortune and national wealth, but, somehow, practice does not always give us these results. Nevertheless, it can not be denied that a correct theory of political economy is of very great importance. This is especially so, at this time, for the American people. When such theories as "A National debt is a National blessing" are finding advocates, and when our National debt has grown to such frightful proportions, it is surely time for the American people to become interested in the study of a science which, if existing heretofore among them at all, has been very imperfectly understood.

Professor Bowen claims that the title of his book is altogether proper, since he holds, with Mr. Samuel Laing, that "every country has a political economy of its own, suitable to its own physical circumstances of position on the globe," and to the character, habits, and institutions of its people. He does not deny that there is "a universal science of political economy, applicable not only to America, but to France, England, and Germany, to all nations under the sun;" but "the universal principles" of such a science are "comparatively few and unimportant." It is "only in the inductive method, by observing and analyzing phenomena in a particular case, and

tracing these up to their sources, the circumstances of the people and principles of human nature in which they originated," that any thing very valuable can be discovered. Hence, "in America we need an American political economy, the principles of the science being adapted to what is special in our physical condition, social position, and industrial pursuits."

We do not now stop to challenge this position further than to say that it needs proof, and should not have been *assumed* in such a pretentious work. Of Professor Bowen's book itself, we can say that it appears to us to be unusually interesting. English books upon political economy are, for the most part, so stuffed with theory that they are intolerably dry. Professor Bowen, adopting the inductive method, relieves his speculations with abundant facts, and thus makes his book rather pleasant reading than otherwise.

On the subject of the tariff, he is certainly not very satisfactory. His doctrine of protection will, doubtless, be palatable to the people of the East, but will find few sympathizers in the great West.

Malthus on population, and Ricardo on rents, find little mercy at the hands of Professor Bowen, and yet he can not be successfully charged with socialistic tendencies. He treats money merely as a medium of exchange without any positive force for good or evil, and thinks it consists in strictness only of specie. Currency he defines as the *current* substitute for money, including under it bank deposits, bonds, notes payable on demand, and promissory notes. Floating capital he defines as "the aggregate of merchandise of all sorts directly exposed for sale." He also measures the depreciation of our currency by the price of gold, holding to the theory that a fall in the latter indicates an improvement of the former.

Many of his views are certainly very questionable, but the book, as a whole, ought to have a healthy influence on the condition of our National finances. Still we think that an improvement in the material of our National Congress, and a growing tendency among all public officials against the now prevalent practice of public stealing, would have a far greater influence on the finances of the country than all the books that have ever been, or can be, written.

9.—*Life at Home; or, The Family and its Members.* By WILLIAM AIKMAN, D. D. New York: S. R. Wells. 16mo. pp. 249. 1870.

EVERY worthy effort to advance our civilization must find its support in the home circle. Human progress is simply an impossible thing, unless there is first a proper organization and government in the family. Much of the discord of society finds its starting-point in the demoralization of home life, and, until this evil is corrected, it will be vain to hope for a millennium of peace.

In almost all the countries of Europe the sacredness of the family circle

is very little understood. Every thing there is conventional; and whatever influence may be exerted through home associations, it can not be said that these associations are much more than a formality. In this country home life is a different thing. It has some *heart* in it, and at once presents the most promising feature of American society for the future. Still, it is far from being what it ought to be. Hence every contribution that will quicken home virtues and correct home vices should be heartily welcomed by every lover of a true civilization.

Dr. Aikman's book deserves to be ranked among the first of its class. Its contents were substantially preached as a series of discourses to the people of the writer's pastoral charge, and, as these discourses were received with great favor, the author was induced to publish them in their present form.

As a specimen of the general style of the book, as well as for its valuable suggestions, we present the following with reference to making home attractive:

"No child, however sentimental, will love a home simply because it has the name of one. If we would have our children love it, we must make it lovely—we must give them something to love in the home.

"Now, if the principal ideas which a child has of his home are, that it is a place where he gets his meals and where he sleeps; where, if he is little, he is perpetually found fault with; where he must keep quiet; where at night-fall he must sit stupidly waiting till bedtime; or, if he have grown older, he can only deem it a dreary room in which he must employ himself as best he may, while the father sits at his paper or dozes in his chair, and the mother is silently busy with her sewing or her book; if such be the aspect of home, one need not wonder that children learn to look elsewhere for pleasure, and seek to find amusement in other circles, or that home is forsaken as soon as it is possible to leave it.

"It is practicable to make home so delightful that children shall have no disposition to wander from it, or prefer any other place; it is possible to make it so attractive that it shall not only firmly hold its own loved ones, but shall draw others into its cheerful circle. Let the house, all day long, be the scene of pleasant looks, pleasant words, kind and affectionate acts; let the table be the happy meeting-place of a merry group, and not a dull board where a silent, if not sullen company of animals come to feed; let the meal be the time when a cheerful laugh is heard, and good things are said; let the sitting-room, at evening, be the place where a smiling company settle themselves to books or games till the round of good-night kisses are in order; let there be some music in the household, music not kept like silk and satins, to show to company, but music in which father and mother, and sister and brother join; let the young companions be welcomed, and made for the time a part of the group, so that daughters shall not deem it necessary to seek the obscurity of back parlors with intimate friends, or to drive father and mother to distant apartments; in a word, let the home be surrounded by an air of cozy and cheerful good-will; then children need not be exhorted to love it; you will not be able to tempt them away from it.

"The ties which bind a child to home are created not so much out of great as from little things; some of them I have hinted at, and many more will suggest themselves to a wise parent. There should be a good many holidays in the home. I believe in anniversaries, and I love, by observing them, to connect time with events, and so give to both a deeper interest. The birthdays of a family should be always noticed, and, in some way, celebrated. The busy preparation of the whole household to make some present to father or mother, or sister or brother, on a birthday or holiday; the many plannings, the workings in by-corners and at odd times; the bundling of work out of sight as the step of the favored one is heard;

the careful stowing of gifts away till the appointed time ; and then, when the looked-for day has come, the presentations, the confused and merry voices, the filled eye, the choked voice, the heart too full to speak in words, memory touched as with an angel's hand, love that can only look its thanks—all these ! who can tell their sweet and mighty power ? A home familiar to such scenes, will it, can it be one that children shall not love ? No, no, from it, when the inexorable time comes to go away, daughters shall pass with sobs of sorrow, and sons, with pressed lips and swimming eyes, and while mother lives it will be a home still—home, though years have gone and other homes have claimed them."

10.—*The Voice of the Seven Thunders; or, Lectures on the Apocalypse.* By Elder J. L. MARTIN. Cincinnati: H. S. Bosworth. 12mo. pp. 330. 1870.

It can not be questioned that we live in times which call for an earnest study of the Apocalypse. God certainly had some purpose in view in giving us that mysterious and wonderful book, and it surely becomes us to use all diligence to understand what that purpose was, and what the book means. That the design of the book is to show us the fortunes of the Church, while in its militant state, can scarcely be doubted. We are permitted to follow it, though sometimes with obscure vision, through its struggles to its final and glorious triumph. These lectures of Mr. Martin are intended to help us understand the meaning of the vision, and we are glad to say they are not wholly unprofitable in this respect. Indeed, for popular use, they give much the best exposition of the Apocalypse that we have seen. Throwing aside all fanciful theories, mere speculations, and burdensome erudition, Mr. Martin confines himself almost exclusively to the Word of God, and to such laws of interpretation as are generally considered to be correct.

Of course we do not approve of all that is said, but the book is characterized by so much practical good sense, and is written with such an earnest spirit, that it can not fail to profit any one who will give it a careful reading.

The lectures were delivered to popular audiences, and phonographically reported. Hence they could not be otherwise than somewhat faulty in style. Still, it is by no means certain that the masses would have liked them so well had they been carefully prepared in the study. The following, from the lecture on the battle of Armageddon, is interesting just at this time :

"And there fell upon men (in the tearing down of these kingdoms) a great hail out of heaven, every stone about the weight of a talent ; and men blasphemed God because of the plague of the hail ; for the plague thereof was exceeding great."

"It is not literal ice falling from the clouds. It is the hail that is to overturn the earthly governments just spoken of, that is to fall on men. This *did* make sores on them, and grievously tormented them. John as certainly not only saw the fire, smoke, and brimstone—ignited gunpowder—doing its work, but he saw the hail sent, and gives us the weight of some of our large cannon-balls, and they fall on men, and make the noisome and grievous sores he had been speaking of. Men blaspheme God while this iron and leaden hail is falling on them, and they repent not of the work of their hands. Do you know that men, in the time of fighting, while the fire, smoke, and brimstone send heavy cannon-balls into the ranks, are blaspheming the God of heaven on account of their pain, and the deadly wounds they receive ? They die with the words of blasphemy on their lips. They do not

all do it, but some of them do. John did not say *all*. He is describing the very hail, and that which sends it, that pulls down the nations and kingdoms of earth—the great battle of God Almighty. This is the wine-press of his wrath which he throws the nations into. He throws them into the deadly fight, not their future state; but nations, as nations on earth, are feeling his mighty power, and the hail will keep on falling. The cannon-balls will still fall until four hundred years have passed away, from the time the nations were let loose to fight. When that was, this deponent saith not. They have been let loose gradually from the days of Luther until recently, when they are all loose. Whether it dates from the commencement of being let loose from the power that held them so long, or from the time they are all loosed, is not for me to say; but my opinion is that the fight will go out gradually; as nations were let loose gradually, nations will go down beneath the mighty hail, which the fire, smoke, and brimstone sends. Men know how the hail is made, how it is sent, and how it comes. And men's hearts are hardened, and they blaspheme God in the midst of the fire, smoke, and brimstone, and great hail war."

II.—*Passages from the English Note-Books of Nathaniel Hawthorne.* In two volumes. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 16mo. pp. 410-393. 1870.

THERE is no name in American literature more fragrant with pleasant memories than that of Nathaniel Hawthorne. And hence, these notes will be welcomed by a very large circle of readers. However we may differ concerning the propriety of their publication, we will scarcely differ concerning their interest and value. They were evidently written without any respect to their publication, and have not, therefore, the finishing touches which their distinguished author would have given them had they been prepared for the public eye.

Perhaps this fact may give additional interest to them in the estimation of many, as we are constantly assured that we are reading the real impressions made upon the mind of the author. Generally speaking, notes of travel are made to change their color very much when they come to be revised at the end of the journey and prepared for publication. Hence, we do not usually get a truthful representation of impressions made upon travelers, for their books are almost invariably modified by the opinion of others, and that still greater influence, the remembrance that the traveler is now writing for the benefit of others. None of these influences can be said to have in any way affected the character of the volumes before us. They are the faithful transcripts of a great mind, keenly sensitive to all that is interesting in a European tour.

Another feature of these volumes is worthy of special mention. Mr. Hawthorne had frequently and emphatically expressed the hope that no one would attempt to write his biography; and on this account we are shut up to his writings as the only means of knowing the character of the man. Of course a daily journal of his thoughts and experiences will furnish us the best index to his life and habits. Hence, these passages from his English note-books will do much toward supplying the want felt in not having a memoir worthy of his name and fame.

Hawthorne himself was a singular compound, and his writings are strongly marked with his personal characteristics. His style unites masculine strength and breadth with feminine delicacy and insight. His power to paint a thing just as it was, has, perhaps, seldom been excelled; especially was this true of him in his portraitures of life and character. He had little interest in art, and visited the picture-galleries of Europe more because it was the habit of travelers to do so than for any thing else. But a noticeable man or woman never failed to attract his attention, while the great thoroughfares of human life in the European cities are the places where he was most frequently found. Singular enough, if he ever visited any of the ordinary places of amusement, he has left no record of it in his notes.

One impression of Hawthorne which has been very general, will, we think, be removed by the publication of these volumes. It has been thought he was gloomy and morbid. This impression, doubtless, was made by the "*Scarlet Letter*," "*The Blithedale Romance*," "*The House of the Seven Gables*," and "*The Marble Faun*." In these works he shows a passion for delineating the dark side of human nature—in painting the struggle of a heart faint with the weight of secret and unconfessed sin. But his own nature was evidently bright and cheerful. And we have only to learn what he was in every-day life to be convinced of this fact.

12.—*Christian Hymn and Tune Book. For use in Churches, and for Social and Family Devotions.* By A. S. HAYDEN. Chicago: Root & Cady. 8vo. pp. 272. 1870.

THE value of such a work as this depends chiefly on three things: first, the character of the hymns selected; second, the adaptation of tunes to the hymns; third, the arrangement of the whole, and size of the book. We think the hymns in this selection, so far as they are taken from the *Christian Hymn Book*, are, for the most part, such as ought to appear in a work of the kind. Still, we think that some might give place to others that would be much more acceptable. In fact, some of the very hymns that make a hymn and tune book necessary, are, strangely enough, left out. Take, for example, the hymn number 840, of the *Christian Hymn-Book*, beginning with

"Beyond the smiling and the weeping."

This is one of the most popular hymns to be found in the hymn-books, but it requires set music to make it available in the Churches. We look for it in vain in Mr. Hayden's collection.

Most of the hymns are from the *Christian Hymn-Book*, and it is a great pity we can not say as much of all of them; for generally those introduced from other sources are simply a disgrace to the collection. Take, as an

illustration, the last two hymns in the book. Surely, those who have a taste for "doggerel," ought to be satisfied with these. Especially is the last one ridiculous in the extreme. It is styled the "Song of the Angel Reapers," in which it is declared that

"We are the reapers that garner in
The sheaves of the good from the fields of sin."

Passing over the fact that this work is to be done with "sickles of truth," we remark that in view of the "tall weeds" and the "harvest tide," we do not see how it were possible for the "harvest" to do any thing else but "wait;" nevertheless, we suppose on account of the great pressure in favor of a forward movement, it will certainly refuse to "wait." At least we hope it will.

We speak thus frankly because the defects of a book which is offered for general use in the Churches ought not to be passed over in silence.

We think the tunes are generally well selected, but are not always well adapted to the hymns to which they are set. We give one example from a hundred that might be named. On page 111 we have Duane-Street, a lively, joyous tune, set to words that require solemn, pathetic music.

The arrangement of the book is good enough, though the shape, we think, might be somewhat improved.

Taken altogether, the work is creditable to the author, and should have a good influence upon the music of our Churches. Still, we think that the evidences of hasty preparation are manifest in many parts, while some things ought certainly to be expunged in future editions. The music is generally simple, and well adapted to congregational singing, and this of itself should, in a measure, redeem the book from the imperfections we have pointed out.

The following is the conclusion of the preface, and is in italic: "Go forth, my minstrel oblation. Bring peace whithersoever thou goest: and may God, through thy minstrelsy, be a blessing to myriads!" This is certainly a new way of placing the relations of a book to the providence of God. We doubt whether it will be generally regarded as an improvement on the old style.

13.—*Sermons Preached at Brighton.* By the late Rev. FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON, the Incumbent of Trinity Chapel. New York: Harper & Brothers. 8vo. pp. 838. 1870.

Life, Letters, Lectures, and Addresses of FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON, M. A. New York: Harper & Brothers. 8vo. pp. 840. 1870.

THIS new and cheap edition of Mr. Robertson's works will, doubtless, be highly acceptable to the reading public. The people have a special interest in the works of such a man. Though himself highly educated, and somewhat secluded in his habits of life from the masses, there is in his writings so much to feed the soul, so much that strikes a common chord

in our humanity, that the simplest heart that struggles and hopes may find in his beautiful thoughts and tender words something to comfort and cheer.

Books of sermons, before the appearance of Mr. Robertson's, had come to be regarded as stale literature, but the sermons of the Brighton preacher were no sooner given to the public than an exception was made in their case. In fact, every body was astonished. Instead of the old platitudes which had been so often repeated, these sermons were found to contain real food for the soul. There was a freshness, vigor, and manly independence about every thing that was said that at once surprised and delighted every one. Then the sermons were so free from the churchy flavor which so often characterizes the pulpit efforts of Episcopal clergymen. Though belonging to the High Church party, his doctrinal views were far from being identical with that party. His views of the nature of the priesthood, and the nature of the sacraments, shut him out completely from the sphere of High Churchmen. Indeed, it would be difficult to fix upon him any theological system. Hence he has been claimed by all parties, and rejected by all. This fact, however, is rather in his favor than otherwise, for the same might be said of the writers of the New Testament. True, these might not have been formally rejected, but what we mean amounts to the same thing.

It is not our aim at present to examine critically Mr. Robertson's writings. To do this would require an extended notice, in which we would be compelled to dissent from many things he has written, but we should not fail to notice his nervous, pungent style; his deep insight into the wants of the soul; his manly utterances in behalf of our fallen race, and his active interest in human progress and in all that beautifies and beatifies mankind. For the present, we can only say, whoever will read these volumes carefully will be amply repaid, though they may not agree with the author on the subject of baptism and many other things.

-
- 14.—*A History of Christian Doctrine.* By WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D. D., *Professor of Biblical Literature in Union Theological Seminary, New York.* Cheap Edition. In two volumes. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 8vo. pp. 408-508. 1870.

THIS new and cheap edition of Professor Shedd's *Christian Doctrine* affords us an opportunity to say a few words concerning a work which has already received the highest tokens of popular favor.

The subject-matter of the work is certainly of the very greatest importance. We may not feel much interest in theology as a science, but the history of the steps by which this science has been developed can not be otherwise than deeply interesting. The struggle of mind through the ages to scientifically formulate its conceptions of God, Christ, and the Christian religion, is surely an interesting study, and can not fail to be of very great

service to all who are willing to learn from experience. Heretofore this department of history has not received the attention to which it is justly entitled, hence we are glad to welcome a work in this department embracing so many popular features as that of Professor Shedd.

Professor Shedd is not so scholarly as Baumgarten-Crusius, nor so concise as Hagenbach, but is more perspicuous and popular than either. His method, it seems to us, is the best that could be adopted. He traces each doctrine through all the ages of the Church, and through all its changes, before he leaves it, and thus gives us a distinct view of its influence in the formation of scientific theology.

The style of the work is excellent—clear, forcible, and earnest, while the spirit is generally that of candor and fairness. The Professor belongs to the strictly orthodox school, and does not, we think, always treat with entire justice those who oppose this school. He is, however, far from being a mere partisan, and generally treats with judicial calmness the questions under discussion.

We can not help noticing a singular omission. It is hard to understand why he does not give some space to the doctrine of Christian baptism. Can it be that the views of orthodoxy in the past have any thing to do with Professor Shedd's silence concerning this matter? Evidently an honest, historical review of the baptismal controversy is not calculated to strengthen modern notions in reference to the ordinance. Still a work which professes to survey the whole field of Christian dogmatics ought to have said something upon a subject which has been so distinctly prominent in the past history of the Church.

15.—*The Seat of Empire.* By CHARLES CARLETON COFFIN, ("Carleton.") Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 16mo. pp. 232. 1870.

The author of this volume was one of the raciest newspaper correspondents which the late war produced. He has since made a tour round the world, and has given us the results of his observations in a very readable volume, which we recently noticed in the "Quarterly." The present volume is an attempt to exhibit something of the prospective greatness of our own country, especially those extensive regions in the North-West.

Mr. Coffin is a close observer, a ready writer, and has brought together within a small compass many important and startling facts, from which he draws a picture, in the conclusion, dazzling enough to satisfy the most enthusiastic admirer of America and American institutions. Nor does he confine the good results of our advancement to this country alone. He says:

"I do not look with desponding eyes into the future. The nations every-where—in Europe, in Asia—the new and the old—are moving upward and onward as never before, and America leads them. Railroads, steam-ships, school-houses, printing-presses, free platforms and pulpits, and open Bible are the impelling forces of the nineteenth century. It

remains only for the Christian men and women of this country to give the Bible, the Sunday and the common school to the coming millions, to insure a greatness and grandeur to America far surpassing any thing in human history.

"It will not be for America alone, for, under the energizing powers of this age, the entire human race is moving on toward a destiny unseen except to the eye of faith, but unmistakably grand and glorious.

"I have been an observer of the civilization of Europe, and have seen the kindlings of new life at the hands of England and the United States in India and China, and through the drifting haze of the future I behold nations rising from the darkness of ancient barbarism into the light of modern civilization, and the radiant cross once reared on Calvary throwing its peaceful beams afar—over ocean, over valley, lake, river, and mountain—illuminating all the earth.

"Situated where the great stream of life will pour its flood from ocean to ocean, beneficently endowed with Nature's riches, and illumined by such a light, there will be no portion of all earth's wide domain surpassing in glory and grandeur this future seat of empire."

16.—*Poems by Dante Gabriel Rossetti.* Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1870.

TRUE poetry will always find in the human heart a recognition. If there is no response from the imagination, from the affections, or some other powers of the soul, it ought to be conclusive evidence that the poetry has some serious defect. True, all poetry has its foundation in some conceit, but this should not be so far removed from the probable as to throw the human mind out of sympathy with it. Poetry may be quite artistic and yet have no soul, may even challenge a moment's admiration without exciting any lasting interest. And this, we think, will be the verdict concerning many of the poems of Rossetti. They are artistic, but they are out of the affairs of common life. They strike few chords of the human heart that thrill through the masses. They are rather the pictures of an artist in his study than the faithful transcripts of real life.

There is another thing which must be said of Rossetti's poems which will not enhance the popular interest in them. Their meaning is often obscure. This may grow out of the fact that the picture on which the poem was written is absent while we are reading. But the artist should have taken this into account. He should have calculated with the understanding that a picture gallery can not move around in the places where his book goes. This is a very serious defect, and makes some of his poems, to the general reader, almost worthless.

There is, however, another side to these poems, which needs to be considered. They are marked by originality, and a deep insight into the sphere of the beautiful. They are frequently shrouded in a sort of psychological mystery, but this in no way detracts from their interest. Half-hidden secrets of the soul are often more interesting than those that are brought distinctly to view. Spots on the sun can only be seen by cutting off some of the light, and the real condition of the human heart often reveals itself where the philosopher would least expect to find it.

- 17.—*The Earthly Paradise; A Poem.* Part III. By WILLIAM MORRIS. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 16mo. pp. 382. 1870.

THE appearance of the third part of Mr. Morris's "Earthly Paradise," has produced quite a sensation in the literary world. Those who had read the "Life and Death of Jason," and Parts I and II of "The Earthly Paradise," were somewhat prepared for the rich feast which the present volume furnishes. And yet, it is doubtful whether any one had ascribed to Mr. Morris, on his previous works, such a position as a poet as he is clearly entitled to. Though "The Earthly Paradise" promises to be unusually long, it nevertheless increases in interest with each successive legend. The present volume closes with the "Lovers of Gudrun," one of the most inimitably charming poems that has ever appeared in the English Language.

Mr. Morris excels all other English poets, not excepting even Chaucer, in his descriptive powers, in the tender delicacy with which he weaves together the materials of his story, and in the simple, but expressive language used to draw his admirable pictures of the tragic actions of his heroes. In our former notice of "The Earthly Paradise," we called attention to the manifest difference between Grecian Mythology and the Northern Legends used by Mr. Morris, as material for poetic composition, and stated that Mr. Morris showed singular power in the treatment of one, and often great weakness in the treatment of the other. We are now compelled to reverse this judgment. The legends drawn from Northern Europe, in Part III of "The Earthly Paradise," are the finest poems which Mr. Morris has yet written, and at once establish the fact that his reputation will not rest alone upon his skillful management of Grecian Mythological stories. We are happy to record this conviction, not only because it is just to Mr. Morris, but because it establishes, beyond question, the fact that it is possible to write a first-class modern poem that is not dependent for material upon the archives of Grecian lore.

-
- 18.—*Charles Dickens: A Sketch of His Life and Works.* By F. B. PERKINS. New York: G. P. Putnam & Sons. 16mo. pp. 264. 1870.

PERHAPS no event of the year has been more generally commented upon than the death of Charles Dickens. His name had become as familiar as household gods, wherever the English language is spoken, and it is altogether safe to say that no writer of the present century had half so many readers.

We can not now enter upon a discussion of the influence of his writings upon society. We can only note the fact that this influence has been very great, and has done much toward developing the humanitarian tendencies of the present age. No one can accuse Charles Dickens's writings with an evil purpose. They may not always have accomplished their aim, but cer-

tain it is that their author never intended any thing evil to humanity in what he wrote. The fault of his writings would seem to be, not so much in what he wrote, but in what he omitted. His effort to satirize the follies of men, and to point out "a more excellent way," without the light of Christianity, could only possibly result in partial good. He told the truth, but did not tell the whole truth. He taught man to be benevolent and kind, but most singularly ignored Him of whom alone it could be said, "He went about doing good."

The volume before us does not profess to be any thing more than a mere sketch of his life and works. It bears the evidence of hasty preparation, but, nevertheless, gives us quite a distinct view of the character of the man and his writings. The reproduction of what was said of some of Mr. Dickens's works at the time of their appearance is very acceptable. Many of these critiques had been forgotten, and their republication now will enable us to see how Mr. Dickens worked his way from comparative obscurity, to the high position in the world of letters which he held when he died.

Some very pleasing anecdotes are related, and, taken all in all, the volume contains an amount of fresh and entertaining reading. A most excellent steel portrait introduces us to the book.

-
- 19.—*The History of Rome.* By THEODOR MOMMSEN. *Translated with the author's sanction and additions, by the REV. WILLIAM P. DICKSON, D. D. With a preface by DR. LEONHARD SCHMITZ.* New Edition, in four volumes. Volume III. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. Crown 8vo. pp. 571. 1870.

THE third volume of this incomparable history opens with a discussion of the subject countries down to the times of the Gracchi, and closes with a most excellent chapter on literature and art as developed under the Commonwealth. The history of the Revolution is given in the author's best style, while the chapters on the Sullan constitution and the Commonwealth and its economy can not fail to be deeply interesting to American readers. We, of all people, have a greater interest in a proper understanding of governmental experiments similar to our own, and nowhere can we find more profitable history than that which is furnished by the Roman people in their efforts at self-government.

Dr. Mommson is especially happy in his delineation of character. Many of the most prominent actors in the period of this volume are made to stand out in such life-like proportions as to bring the past of more than two thousand years ago into the living active present. We do not think he has eminently a judicial mind. His convictions are too positive, and his enthusiasm too great for calm, unbiased judgments. Still, he is so scholarly,

and moves through the ages with such majestic step, sweeping such a mighty circle with such apparent ease, that we do not stop to question his conclusions, or even to challenge the data from which his conclusions are drawn. His own great genius transposes the dry historic material into living pictures, and thus reproduces with marvelous distinctness the age of which he writes.

20.—*Out of the Past: (Critical and Literary Papers.)* By PARKE GODWIN. New York: G. P. Putnam & Sons. 12mo. pp. 461. 1870.

OUR country has produced very few first-class essayists. Indeed, for a long time, no one attracted any particular attention in this direction. Recently, however, it is coming to light that we have really some able pens in this field of literature. Such men as Lowell, Emerson, and Godwin, are not unworthy to be classed among the best essayists of England, and it is grateful to our American pride to have their writings published in as attractive a style as is the present volume of Mr. Godwin.

These papers are claimed to be gathered out of the anonymous and desultory writings of many years past, not because they are supposed to possess any particular literary value, but simply to show what little part the author took in various discussions. This, of course, is modest enough on the part of Mr. Godwin, but will by no means determine the value of the volume in the mind of the careful critical reader. To such a one Mr. Godwin's collection of essays will have a positive value. Such papers as "Journalism," "American Authorship," "Comte's Philosophy," "Strauss's Life of Jesus," "Causes of the French Revolution," and "Motley's Rise of the Dutch Republic," will never grow old. 'T is true, they were written mainly for present effect, and were published in the magazines of the past twenty years. Still they have a permanent value, which will give them a place among the literature of our country for many years yet to come.

21.—*Illustrated Library of Wonders.* New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

WE take pleasure in calling attention again to this valuable contribution to literature. No such library has ever been attempted before, and yet, we do not see in what respect this one could be materially improved. So far as it aims to go, it is well-nigh perfect. And as a popular treatise upon some of the most important themes of science and art, it is truly invaluable.

We have received the following additional volumes: "The Sun," by Amede Guillemain; "The Sublime in Nature," by Ferdinand De Lanoyer; "The Wonders of Pompeii," by Marc Monnier; "The Wonders of the

Human Body," by A. L. Pileur; "Wonders of Glass-making in all Ages," by A. Sauzay; "Wonders of Architecture," by R. Donald.

All these volumes are copiously illustrated, and are written in an easy, popular style, and, as the authors avail themselves of all the latest discoveries, their books contain a concise, yet clear, and satisfactory statement of what is at present known concerning the subjects treated of.

These volumes must be intensely interesting and valuable to the young, and should at once be substituted in all Sunday-school and family libraries for that worthless class of juvenile literature with which the country is flooded, whose chief recommendation is the disproportion between its *pious* pretensions and the effect produced upon the mind of the reader.

22.—*In Spain, and a Visit to Portugal.* By HANS CHRISTIAN ANDERSEN, author of the "Improvisatore," etc. New York: Hurd and Houghton. Cambridge: Riverside Press. 12mo. pp. 289. 1870.

HANS CHRISTIAN ANDERSEN is too well known to almost all classes of readers to need any commendation. A book from his pen carries with it the assurance that it is beautifully written and full of passages of unequalled power. In Spain he had just the scenes and memories necessary to excite his peculiar talent to its highest degree of excellence. There is such a romantic charm about many of the places he visited, that we do not wonder his poetic mind should have given us pictures that seem more like ideals than any thing that belongs to real life.

But the value of his book does not consist chiefly in its charming style and vivid descriptions of ancient relics. It is worth while to read it for its life-like representation of what Spain is to-day. How wonderful, indeed, are the transformations which are there now taking place! With what rapidity has the country emerged from imbecility and misrule to strength and the promise of good government! Just now it is unusually interesting to read of this land, and nowhere will we be better entertained than in the volume before us.

23.—*The Princes of Art; Painters, Sculptors, and Engravers.* Translated from the French by Mrs. S. R. URBINO. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 12mo. pp. 337. 1870.

THIS volume does not pretend to be exhaustive, but is none the less valuable on that account. Its sketches are well written, and generally seize upon the most important points of character in the subjects. The book is both instructive and highly entertaining. Every one who makes any pretension to scholarship should know something of such architects and sculptors as Phidias, Polycletus, Leonardo Da Vinci, Michael Angelo, Buona-

rotti, and Canova; also such painters as Aristides, Apelles, Titian, Raphael, Paul Veronese, Guido Reni, Murillo, Rubens, Van Dyck, Rembrandt, Salvator Rosa, etc. And surely the history of such men can not fail to present much that is highly interesting.

The American people have not been famous for their devotion to art. Hence, we are glad to welcome a work so well adapted to popular use—one that ought to excite our countrymen to greater devotion in this direction. We trust that the book will be generally read, as it will surely exert a refining influence on the taste and habits of the American people.

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

- 24.—*Die Naturkräfte in ihrer Wechselbeziehung. Populäre Vorträge von ADOLF FICK, Professor der Physiologie in Würzburg.* (The Forces of Nature in their Correlation. Popular Lectures by ADOLF FICK, Professor of Physiology in Würzburg.) Würzburg, 1869. Cr. 8vo. pp. 71.

THIS is a small book on a great subject. It goes over the whole ground of the physical theory of the universe, and, inasmuch as it assumes to give the last (provisional) results of modern scientific research, it is a matter of no small concern to learn them. For, although we are not directly concerned with natural science, our Quarterly not being devoted to the investigation and elucidation of the phenomena of the material universe, nevertheless, indirectly, the accredited conclusions of naturalists are of the utmost moment to us.

Here are six lectures, in which the modern mechanical theory of the universe is clearly presented and quite fully discussed. The plan which the author sketched for himself in the beginning was as follows:

"After having recognized in heat a certain mode of motion, we must learn how to measure quantities of heat by the general mechanical measure of motion, that is, we must become acquainted with the *mechanical equivalent* of heat. The consideration of this topic will naturally be followed by a discussion of the general *principle of the conservation of force, the highest and most fruitful generalization of which the whole body of natural science, up to this day, can boast.* Having gained this point of view, we shall then easily take in at a glance how all the processes of Nature consist solely in the taking on, by this same fundamental force of motion, of new and ever-new forms. From *this* point of view we shall have, in a few words, to determine in principle the correlation of the various agents, heat, light, electricity, magnetism, chemical affinity, gravitation, and mechanical motion in general. When this is done we will investigate more in detail the transmutation of forces as exhibited in the two most interesting theaters of action, in the microcosm of our own body and in the macrocosm of the universe."

We have not, of course, space to follow Professor Fick through the whole of his exceedingly interesting lectures, but we can not refrain from translating the *résumé* at the close entire. We think many of our readers will agree with us that it is a rather astonishing conclusion for a scientific man in these days to come to. Really, it almost seems as if the hitherto would-be omnipotent mechanical theory of the universe were going to stand in need of a God to help it out! Here is the conclusion:

"Let us take one more glance from Mayer's point of view at the transmutation of forces in the universe. We began with the animal world; here we saw living forces take their rise, and we found their source in chemical tension between oxygen and carbon: this was, as it were, the bent spring, the unbending of which keeps the clock-work of the animal body in motion. But we saw, furthermore, that this spring is continually bent afresh, in that oxygen is continually separated from carbon, with which it was combined. We saw that this takes place in plants at the expense of living force which the sun radiates to us. We considered, further, that the sun must, however, eventually cool off if the *vis viva* lost by radiation is not restored to it. After weighing various possibilities there remained only the assumption that the impact of heavy masses, which, following the mighty attraction of gravitation, are constantly falling from immeasurable heights into the sun, restores to it the living force lost by radiation. It is certainly remarkable that we recognize in the attraction which binds the celestial bodies in infinite space together the real source of power even for the most minute processes on the earth's surface. *Thus we have at length found in universal gravitation, so to say, the bent spring which keeps the whole clock-work of the universe in motion.* Can this spring, also, be bent ever afresh? and can thus the transmutation of forces in the universe form an ever-recurring cycle, or must the clock of the universe (if the metaphor is permissible) sometime run down? From the point of view of Mayer's theory the question would take the following more concrete form: Can the heat produced by the impact of meteoric masses on the sun's surface be in any way applied so as to throw off such masses again from the sun into immeasurable distances, so that the act of falling down and producing heat may begin anew? Only on the supposition that this is possible could the existence of the universe in its present order be regarded as eternal. Thus only is it conceivable that organic life could continue on planetary bodies to all eternity. Now, we really do not see how finite masses could be thrown off again from the sun with such velocity that they would rise to those heights from whence they had fallen. On the contrary, much can be adduced to show that this is even impossible and inconceivable.

"Clausius has, under the title of the second main proposition of the mechanical theory of heat, advanced and demonstrated a proposition which enables us to give a final answer to the question before us. I am sorry, however, not to be able, under the present circumstances, to expound to you this remarkable proposition, because it can not well be done without employing mathematical calculation. I can, therefore, only make the assertion without proof: If the second proposition of the mechanical theory of heat, just referred to, is universally valid, and especially if it can be applied to temperatures such as are reached on the sun and on other, perhaps still hotter, celestial bodies, then we can make the assertion quite general, *for the whole universe*, not merely for the solar system alone, that the mechanical tension once converted into heat can never be *wholly* reconverted into tension, and, inasmuch as the former conversion continually takes place, all the force in the universe must finally assume the form of heat, and all differences of temperature in the universe be at the same time equalized. *It would then be impossible that the whole chain of physical events in the universe should be an ever-recurring cycle, and that in spite of the ever-repeated expiration thereof, the universe, as a whole, should continue in a condition eternally the same. We should, on the contrary, have to attribute to the universe, as such, as a whole, a process of development tending toward a goal.*

"This goal, however, would be, as I have already said, the equalization of all differences of temperature, therefore—in the sense of organic existence—*universal death*. This final

condition, which is then, to be sure, capable of eternal continuance, would be nearly reached after the lapse of a finite period of time calculated from any primary condition whatsoever, which does not include infinite velocities or infinite dispersion of matter in space, that is, *calculated from any primary condition at all conceivable*. Conversely, therefore, the final condition must already have been reached if the universe had existed from all eternity.

"Thus we see ourselves, at the close of our investigations, confronted by the following alternative: either essential points have been overlooked in connection with the highest, most general, and most fundamental abstractions of natural science, or—if these abstractions are perfectly accurate and universally valid—then the universe can not have existed from all eternity, but must, at a point of time not infinitely remote from the present day, have had its origin in an event not included in the chain of natural causes, that is, in an act of creation."

This strikes us as a somewhat portentous *aut-aut*, and we are curious to see the reception it meets with in the scientific world.

25.—*Dieu dans la Nature*, par CAMILLE FLAMMARION. *Sixième édition*. (God in Nature, by CAMILLE FLAMMARION. Sixth edition.) Paris: Didier & Cie. 12mo. pp. xx, 552. 1870.

IN connection with the lectures of Professor Fick, we take pleasure in calling attention, also, to the work of M. Flammarion. Not that we regard it as a great book, or as of very extraordinary merit in any direction, for we do not. Great books are of different make-up from this. When they treat of subjects such as this one treats of, they are at their ease; they do not squirt and sputter, and get into fine rages, and indulge in high-flown language; they are serene and tranquil as an Arcadian summer, and one feels their power in the tremendous grip which they have on the matter in hand, and in the majestic, though noiseless, sweep of the discourse to the appointed goal. They are seldom entertaining and amusing, and are always unfit reading for an idle hour. One of the chief faults we have to find with M. Flammarion is that he scintillates and coruscates too much; that he fumes and agonizes to an extent that is sometimes painful. He certainly has in the main a very clear conception of the nature of the problems he has to deal with, and there is, therefore, no reason why he should not drive right at them, without so much rant and by-play. No one can have a heartier admiration than we for that power of statement and presentation which the French writers possess in such eminent degree; but we have often felt that, while accepting and thankful for the light, we should be quite willing to dispense with some of the noise. They seem to have a chronic horror of dull books, and to regard it as their bounden duty to make every treatise, no matter on what theme, "as interesting as a novel." Thus the matter is always in danger of being sacrificed to the form, and the more serious the matter the greater the danger. Of course there are exceptions. No criticism of this sort can be applied to any literature in the bulk. But he who should fail to see the justice of our remark as applied to French writers, as

a rule, would simply betray either his want of acquaintance with French literature, or his want of appreciation of the relation of style to the subject-matter.

But M. Flammarion's book is, after all, far too good to be dismissed for faults of this sort. It handles a great subject, and with ability. As a work coming from a scientific man, who is in no way bound by the exigencies of ecclesiastical connection to arrive at certain results, and yet bearing such earnest testimony to the essential truths of morals and religion, we welcome it, and should be glad to see it widely circulated among English readers.

The work is divided into five books, treating, respectively, of "Force and Matter," "Life," "The Soul," "The Destiny of Beings and Things," "God;" and it is but just to say that there is scarcely a problem connected with these great topics which does not come into view, and meet with more or less thorough discussion.

26.—*L'Idée de Dieu dans la Critique Contemporaine*, par E. CARO, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Paris. Ouvrage couronné par l'Académie Française. Quatrième édition. (The Idea of God in Contemporary Criticism, by E. CARO, Professor in the Faculty of Letters at Paris. Work Crowned by the French Academy.) Paris. 12mo. pp. 396.

AN excellent companion-work to the one above noticed is this of M. Caro, already favorably known through several works as a writer of more than common ability, both as a critic and as a historian. He goes over much of the same ground, with more sedate and firmer, and not less elastic, tread, than the author of whom we have just spoken. He considers, first, the "Origins of the New Philosophy;" tracing the influence of German speculation and criticism, and then of Positivism and the natural sciences, he reduces the *Philosophie Nouvelle* to three principal forms, and takes MM. Rénan, Taine, and Vacherot as types of these forms, and makes them the subjects of his study. M. Taine appears to him to go back, by sympathies confused enough, to Hegel and Spinoza, although method and doctrine attach him more particularly to the Positivist school, where he occupies a distinguished position. Having in a former work, "*Etudes Morales sur le Temps Présent*," carefully treated the principles and conclusions of the school of Comte, M. Caro devotes himself here to the consideration of that original and peculiar form which the energetic individuality of M. Taine has impressed upon Naturalism. Passing to M. Vacherot, our author regards his doctrine as seeming, at first view, not very far removed from Positivism:

"It is purged with the greatest care of all idea of a transcendent Cause. But, while refusing altogether to believe in the existence of a reality superior to the world, M. Vacherot pretends to save the essential part of metaphysics. He admits *concepts à priori*, which impose themselves upon what is given in experience, where they give light and order; he admits God, explaining him, it is true, in his own way, reducing him to nothing but an

abstraction. But the importance which he gives in philosophy to these concepts *a priori*, and especially to the divine ideal, insures him a place by himself, to say nothing of his faith in the psychological sciences and in the freedom of the soul in willing, nor, finally, of his power of analysis, which is of the first order."

As the representative of the most popular, because the most vague, phase of the new philosophy, the author chooses M. Rénan:

"At one time it is a sort of scientific skepticism, of Positivism, tearing itself away by a conscious, definite effort from the dreams of ancient humanity, taking part against illusions; at another, a mysticism gushing forth in aspirations and ecstasies toward an ideal object, which it knows not how to define. A criticism eternally suspended between faiths which cruel reason disavows and negations annoying to an artistic sensibility, here is, to say the truth, a peculiar and interesting state of mind rather than a philosophy."

After this preliminary partitioning of the subject our author begins his treatment of the various phases of the new philosophy with two chapters on M. Rénan. He finds that Rénan has at different periods given forth two different notions of God. He shows this from his published works, and holds him to an account for it. The one conception is peculiar to his earlier writings, which are collected in the "*Etudes d'Histoire Religieuse*," and the other to those published subsequently. From an exposition of the different ideas of God advanced by Rénan, the writer proceeds to an exhibition of the method and results of the celebrated *Vie de Jésus*. After this comes a chapter devoted to the "New Birth of Naturalism," and to M. Taine in particular, giving an account of his philosophy, of his theory of reason, and of substances and causes; and also of his literary criticisms, in which this philosophy finds expression. Then follows a chapter treating of "the God of Idealism," and of the system of M. Vacherot. This is succeeded by two of the most interesting chapters of the book, on "Recent Doctrines concerning the Future Life," in which the pantheists and the idealists, the skeptics, the utopians of immortality, and the poets of immortality, are separately considered. The concluding chapter is occupied with a discussion of the spiritual philosophy and its adversaries. In this chapter he devotes a section to the definition of God, which commends itself to his judgment; and, as we are, after all, more deeply interested in his own positive knowledge than in his criticisms of others, and as this section gives a fair sample of the style and spirit of the work, we translate it entire:

"Let us venture, taking up again the thought of Anaxagoras and completing it, to give the spiritualistic definition of God. We are called upon to explain this word, the vague and complex meaning of which gives rise, it is said, to such different interpretations. Why should we not respond to the call? This definition will be the quite natural conclusion of our book.

"Let us tell, to begin with, what God is not. He is not that Cosmical Being, of which men tell us, the substance of all the phenomena and all the individuals of which the universe is composed. The substance or totality of phenomena, this God is nothing but the universe, and is not in any way distinct from it. Here we are in absolute pantheism, and in pantheism of the grossest kind. Moreover, this God who realizes himself in Nature, has all the imperfections thereof. How can we worship the imperfect? This involves a contradiction.

"He is not that geometrical Law of things, that generative Formula of phenomena, which explains them and of which it is said, on account of this, that it produces them—that blind principle of universal order which would only be, well understood, the mathematical necessity of the actions and reactions of contrary forces, put in place of Chance or of the ancient *Fatum*. A Law, a Formula, mathematical Necessity, none of these are beings, and a God who is not a being is for us not God.

"Whence it follows equally that God is no longer that sovereign Perfection, that Absolute Beauty, Goodness, Truth, which is celebrated with such magnificence, if this Perfection, this Absolute, is intended to be only the pure Ideal of thought. We are told that it follows of necessity that if God is perfection he does not exist, that reality and perfection are a contradiction; that it must be admitted either that God is only an abstraction, or, if he exists, he is not ideally perfect. We frankly confess that we do not comprehend this pretended necessity. In our judgment, the only contradiction is in pretending to clothe a pure ideal in the form of the most chimerical and the most useless of divinities.

"God will no longer be that pure Being with which, according to Hegel, every thing begins and which analysis finds to be identical with Nothing. He will be neither that indeterminate principle which develops itself by contradiction, nor that Absolute Spirit which is the termination of the dialectical movement. It would be equally a contradiction whether one gave the name of God to that Being, void of reality, which Hegel places at the beginning of things, or to that Absolute which is the last result of universal *becoming*. No, God can not be reduced to this miserable alternative: either to be that which at its origin is most imperfect, or to be the last conclusion and product of the work of Nature.

"Shall we fall back upon such a conception as is easily comprehended by means of the imagination; and shall we make God simply an enlarged type of the human soul? But there would be peril in insisting too much on such analogies. To conceive of God as a soul similar to that with which we are acquainted, as to its nature and its faculties, simply elevated to a superior degree, this would expose one to the serious reproach of anthropomorphism. To figure God to one's self as a perfected soul, this would be pure psychological idolatry. He is real and living, without doubt; but he is also perfect; let us not forget that.

"'You want,' men tell us, 'to reunite, as the vulgar do, under the name of God, ideas the most widely different. Why, your God will be, at one and the same time, perfect and infinite, ideal and real, universal and personal.'

"Yes, with the necessary reservations and explanations. Every thing depends in such matters, on exact definitions; in which regard men are far from having come to an understanding. Taken in a certain sense, the words *infinite*, *ideal*, *universal*, have assuredly nothing contradictory to the ideas of perfection, reality, personality, to which men oppose them. But it is quite true that it would be too strong a contradiction to say that the Infinite is perfect, if the Infinite signifies the All; or, further, that the Ideal is real, if the Ideal is made a pure notion; or, finally, that the Universal is a person, if one understands by that the universality of beings. In this sense God is neither the infinite, nor the ideal, nor the universal, because he is neither the totality of beings nor an abstraction. But in defining these various words thus our adversaries prejudice the question. There are, however, real contradictions in words, which men liberally father upon us,

"Indeed, philosophy would perhaps act wisely in using with sobriety these words—the Absolute, the Infinite, the Ideal—for the purpose of designating God; terms that are obscure and abstract, and which need, in order to present a clear meaning to the mind, to be determined by another notion. Left to themselves they have the fault of not representing any thing real, concrete, living. The habit, which even spiritualistic philosophers have fallen into, of designating God by these expressions, has contributed not a little to the diffusion in men's minds of these ambiguities, from which metaphysics has so much to suffer.

"What a vague notion is that of the *Absolute*! Standing alone, what does it represent? To begin with, there is the inconvenience of its applying quite as well to every other thing as to God. This is the first cause of misunderstanding. With many philosophers the absolute corresponds with sufficient exactness to what Kant called the *noumenon*, cause, sub-

stance, essence, that which is primitive, fundamental in beings, anterior to all determination, that which subsists under the series of phenomena. It is in this sense that the Positivists, for example, declare the investigations concerning the absolute to be illusory. They comprehend in this not merely the Divine Cause, but all cause, all substance, as opposed to phenomena. When they say that *the absolute* is the philosopher's stone which haunts metaphysics—this last form of alchemy—they mean to banish all speculation concerning the essence of the soul and that of bodies, as well as concerning God.

"This is the first sense of the word. Here is a second and a third. Hegel alone offers us two different significations of the same term: with him the Absolute is at once the beginning and the end of the movement of Nature; but the absolute which he puts at the beginning of things is an abstract absolute; that which he finds again at the end of the dialectical process is a real, actual absolute. Which of these is the veritable absolute, the abstract or the concrete?

"Finally, the spiritualistic philosophers generally set apart this word to designate God, understanding by it the absolute in being, in cause, in substance—cause, substance, which does not depend on any condition whatever, but exists in and by itself. But, then, why this strange ellipsis, which leads to so many difficulties? When you tell me of a *pure absolute*, with nothing which determines it for my mind, I do not know whether you are talking to me of the *noumenon* of Kant, of the incognizable essence of matter or of spirit, of the indeterminate Being of Hegel, with which every thing begins, or of the spirit by which every thing is achieved, or, finally, of a God such as Descartes has in mind when he speaks of the Infinite and the Perfect. This is certainly to be regretted. Philosophical language is not fixed. Every one decomposes or recomposes it as he likes. One can discuss the Absolute a long while without knowing what object he is talking about.

"The same observations apply to *the Infinite*. I verily believe that it is one of those words which, since the days of Descartes, have given rise to the greatest number of vain disputes. Strauss, a true Hegelian, understands by the infinite the All, the totality of existing things, and from that point of view he has no difficulty in convincing us that in making our God personal we fall into a gross contradiction. Other philosophers incline to reconcile, by analogies more fanciful than useful, the mathematical infinite, that is to say, a pure law of the mind, with the metaphysical infinite, which is the character of the supreme reality. But the mathematical infinite expresses the impossibility of our knowing the ever-fleeing limit of a given quantity. The metaphysical infinite marks the perfection of being. What relation is there, other than a verbal relation, between the impossibility of fixing a limit to the increase or diminution of a given quantity and the impossibility of conceiving an imperfection in God. Again, there is only a very distant analogy, born of a metaphor. Let us be on our guard against these abuses of words.

"The *Ideal* also, taken by itself, with nothing to fix our ideas concerning it, seems to me to involve no less of peril in the use of it as a synonym for God. Generally the ideal is set over against the real. The constant habit of setting one of these two terms in opposition to the other leads the mind, by a certain sort of logic, to the conclusion that if God is the Ideal, it is on condition of not being real. God will be nothing more than the Ideal opposed to the world of reality, a pure concept over against the transient phenomena.

"All these words, *the absolute*, *the infinite*, *the ideal*, need to be interpreted. I do not reject them; I want them explained. No one of them says with sufficient clearness, of itself alone, that God exists other than in idea; that he exists in reality; that he acts, lives. All seem, on the contrary, to introduce into the mind the notion of a principle rather than that of a being, of a law rather than that of a reality. The spiritualistic philosophy was wrong in viewing with complacency these abstractions, which afterward on occasion turned against it. It has thus contributed its part to this confusion of ideas of which it to-day complains.

"Let us return to those simple expressions by which God was designated in the older metaphysics: the First Cause, the Being of Beings, adding thereto the attribute which best determines his relation to the world—intelligence. Here no ambiguity is possible; for we are concerned with a reality. The *actus purus*, the eternal act of thought, first cause,

and supreme reality—I believe I comprise in this definition what is most intelligible of God to human reason.

"I hasten to declare, in answer to difficulties which I foresee, that for me the Absolute Cause, defined as it ought to be, implies essentially the distinction of substances; that it does not indicate the evolution of one substance, modifying itself and producing from within outward the system of its effects; that it supposes the act of an exterior and superior being; that it exists in itself, above and outside of the series of beings and phenomena which it produces. Here we have what must be clearly understood. We must also guard against confounding the real and living bond of the divine causality with the purely logical and abstract bond of the reason of things or of law. In one sense it is very true that God is the reason of things, since even the substance of things is grounded on his act and their development regulated by his thought; but this act, this thought, is a transcendent cause, that is, distinct from the series of its effects. This particularly delicate point of the definition can not be too much insisted upon; on it depend the gravest interests of metaphysics.

"When it is well established that God is not immanent, mixed up with the world, that he is outside of Nature, all danger of serious misunderstanding is removed. Thenceforward we ask nothing better than to take back again all those incomplete definitions which we have successively eliminated, and which, explained, strengthened by ours, present no further difficulty of interpretation. God will still be, if not the substance of cosmical existence, at least the principle of the reality of this existence. His act, his thought, envelops and penetrates it. The atom subsists only by a mathematical law, which is the divine thought constituting matter in its humble degree, and maintaining it in intelligible conditions of being. God will still be, in this way, the law of organization, the principle of the plastic energy which reveals itself in bodies and which disposes the parts thereof with regard to a common end—the living formula of each type, keeping life in the invariable frame-work of the species, preventing it from uselessly scattering itself—the occult and ever-active force of Nature, impressing upon the confused mass of things the movement which orders and distributes them. At the same time God will be the perfect model of the human soul, the supreme intelligence in eternal action, which resembles the soul in the contingent action that constitutes it. Finally, God will be the Ideal, the veritable ideal being, not the abstraction, but the perfection, of reality. To idealize being is not to destroy it; it is to take away its limitations, to free it from imperfection, to recover the divine model under the grosser image.

"This is not a demonstration that we are giving here; it is a pure and simple definition of God, nothing more; destined to terminate the debate on the topic with which we are concerned, and to do away with all ambiguity of ideas.

"This definition will, perhaps, seem very abstract to many persons. But they must comprehend that the spiritualistic philosophy ought to be on its guard against justifying by the use of metaphorical expressions the hackneyed epigrams on the divine architect—'supreme superintendent, seated somewhere above the clouds, on a throne surrounded by thunders and lightnings.' They must, moreover, consider that God is the object of rational intuition, not of sensible experience; that hence, while fully affirming his living reality, without which there is no God for us, our definition ought to address itself to the pure understanding alone, and give nothing to the representative faculties, such as the imagination, which can bring to metaphysics nothing but trouble.

"This is, after all, the living God, the intelligent God, whom we defend against the God of Naturalism, who is only a geometrical law or a blind force; against the Hegelian God, who is only an indeterminate being, the origin and beginning of things, or the absolute spirit, a result and product of the universe; against the God of a new idealism which, in order to save his divinity, deprives him of reality. We affirm, as against all subtle and hazardous conceptions, that a perfect being, who did not exist, would not be perfect; that a pure Ideal of thought is not God; that if he is not substance he is only a concept, a mere category of the mind, a creation and a dependent of my thought, which, in becoming extinct, annihilates its God; that if he is not a cause, he is the most useless of beings; that if he is a cause, he is distinct from the series of his effects; finally, that if he is Cause,

he is Reason, supreme and self-conscious Thought; for, if he were not this he would be nothing but an agent of Fate, a blind energy of the universe, inferior to that which it produces, since in the organic system of its effects that intelligence breaks forth of which he is deprived, and in man divine reason shines out.

"One more characteristic, and our definition will be finished. This living God, this intelligent God, is also a loving God. Men insist much in our day on the sentiment of the divine, on the consciousness which beautiful souls have of God as present and intimate in their whole being, on the blessedness of taking refuge, in hours of sorrow and trouble, in the arms of the *Heavenly Father*, and of calling him *my Father*! I should applaud the great feeling manifest in these words; but this mystical language troubles me as a contradiction. Many writers who employ it refuse to respond when I press them with the simple question, Does this *Father*, whom you adore, in reality exist? Does he know you, love you? And yet nothing is more evident, more simple, than that it is necessary to believe that there is a real being to whom one addresses his adoration, the grandest phenomenon of the moral life; one must believe that there is a God who knows us, who demands our whole heart, and who responds to it. A God who did not love, would not be worthy of being adored. Adoration is only the highest degree of love, and love presupposes that its object can love in return: there is no love without this. One can not *adore* a law, however simple and prolific it may be; one can not *adore* a force, if it is blind, however powerful, however universal it may be; nor an ideal, if it be simply that, if it is an abstraction. One can adore only a Being who is living perfection, the perfection of reality in its highest forms, Thought, Love. All other adoration involves an absurdity if it concern something purely abstract—idolatry, if it concern the substance of the universe.

"Here we have God as reason conceives him, as the religious consciousness of man demands him. This is our God."

27.—*Das Recht der Eigenen Ueberzeugung. Von J. FROHSCHAMMER.* (The Right of Private Judgment. By J. FROHSCHAMMER.) Leipzig: Cr. 8vo. pp. xv, 238.

THIS book was written on the eve of the Council of the Vatican, and has four main divisions. The first division discusses "The Right of Truth and the Right of Conviction," in which the author treats of the absolute right of truth and the historical consequences thereof, then of truth in the form of human conviction and the inferences therefrom, and finally of the right means of bringing about an acknowledgment of the truth. The second division treats of "The State and Religious Belief," giving a succinct history of the relation of the state to religion, then arguing the impossibility of the State or Natural Science recognizing and acknowledging any religious authority as absolutely divine, and, finally, giving a sketch of the new relation which has sprung up between Church and State. The third division treats of "The State and Religious Freedom," especially of the injuriousness of compulsion in matters of faith, and of the objections to unlimited freedom of faith and worship, demonstrating the necessity of complete liberty, and giving his views of the relation of the State to this liberty. The last division is devoted to "The Modern State and the Catholic Church," giving a remarkable *characteristique* of the Roman Hierarchy, and demonstrating the incompatibility of absolute ecclesiastical rule with the modern State, and the right of the latter to oppose it.

THE
CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

No. VIII.

OCTOBER, 1870.

Πάντα δοκιμάζετε τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε.—1 THESS. V. 21.

EDITOR.

W. T. MOORE,

PASTOR OF CENTRAL CHURCH OF CHRIST, CINCINNATI.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS.

W. K. PENDLETON,

PRESIDENT OF BETHANY COLLEGE, WEST VA.

ISAAC ERRETT,

EDITOR OF CHRISTIAN STANDARD, CINCINNATI.

ROBERT GRAHAM,

PRES. OF HOCKER FEMALE COLLEGE, LEXINGTON, KY.

DR. S. E. SHEPARD,

PASTOR OF CHURCH OF CHRIST, CLEVELAND, OHIO.

THOMAS MUNNELL,

COR. SEC. OF AMER. CHRIS. MISS. SOCIETY.

ALEXANDER PROCTER,

PASTOR OF CHURCH OF CHRIST, INDEPENDENCE, MO.

CINCINNATI:

R. W. CARROLL & CO., PUBLISHERS,

115 AND 117 WEST FOURTH-STREET.

Terms.—Four Dollars a year. Six Copies, Twenty-one Dollars. Twelve Copies, Forty Dollars. Twenty Copies, Sixty-five Dollars. Single Number, One Dollar. Postage, 12 cents a year, payable in advance, at the office of delivery.

CONTENTS OF No. VIII.—OCTOBER, 1870.

	PAGE
I. CONFIRMATION,	433
II. THE SPIRIT OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND CREEDS,	461
III. THE HUMAN SPIRIT AND THE ANIMAL SOUL—IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THEM A DIFFERENCE OF KIND OR DEGREE?	472
IV. SYDNEY SMITH,	487
V. REGENERATION—THE NEW BIRTH,	499
VI. PROPHETIC INSPIRATION,	513
VII. NATURALISM,	522
LITERARY NOTICES,	542
<p>1. Christianity and Greek Philosophy—2. Miracles, Past and Present—3. Life of Elder John Smith—4. Debate on the Action, Design, and Subject of Baptism—5. The Primeval World of Hebrew Tradition—6. The Life of our Lord—7. Free Russia—8. American Political Economy—9. Life at Home—10. The Voice of the Seven Thunders—11. Passages from Hawthorne's English Note-Books—12. Christian Hymn and Tune Book—13. Sermons Preached at Brighton—14. A History of Christian Doctrine—15. The Seat of Empire—16. Poems by Dante Gabriel Rossetti—17. The Earthly Paradise—18. Charles Dickens—19. The History of Rome—20. Out of the Past—21. Illustrated Library of Wonders—22. In Spain—23. The Princes of Art.</p>	
<i>Foreign Literature,</i>	568
<p>24. Die Naturkräfte in ihrer Wechselbeziehung—25. Dieu dans la Nature—26. L'Idée de Dieu dans la Critique Contemporaine—27. Das Recht der Eigenen Ueberzeugung.</p>	

For terms of subscription see first and third page of cover.

"THE CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY"

WILL be devoted to the advocacy of Primitive Christianity, as distinguished from the religion of sects. It will discuss, with freedom and impartiality, the important questions which from time to time engross the attention of the Religious World, and will review such books as may be issued bearing upon these subjects, and also literary and scientific works of a high order. And while it will give proper attention to History—to the Lessons of the Past—it will be mainly devoted to the discussion of the great Living Issues of the Present—the questions which more especially concern the Church of God to-day.

The Present Age is characterized by an immense amount of activity in all the Departments of Human Thought and Action; and this peculiarity is especially noticeable in the Religious World. Every-where the old foundations of society are breaking up, while there is a very general outcry for something better—something more in harmony with the Present and Eternal Welfare of the Race. To assist in giving a proper direction to this earnest inquiry, to contribute to the Unity and Spiritual Growth of the Children of God, and to develop ways and means for carrying on the great work of Converting the World, is the purpose to which the Quarterly shall be sacredly devoted.

In dealing with these matters, it will be the aim of the Quarterly to maintain a dignified and courteous bearing toward all from whom it may differ, to cultivate a fraternal spirit with all who, out of a pure heart, call upon the name of the Lord every-where, but it will be uncompromising in its treatment of what its editors conceive to be Error, as well as unyielding in its demands for the Truth as it is revealed in the Holy Scriptures. In short, it is the purpose of all connected with the editorial department to make the Quarterly a high-toned, able, and earnest advocate of the religion of the New Testament, in opposition to all human systems and traditions of men.

It is believed that such a publication is needed; that the times require a fearless and unsectarian magazine, which will occupy the broadest grounds of a true catholicity, to do battle against religious error in the Protestant forms which it assumes in this age of stirring thought and earnest investigation; a magazine whose articles will be somewhat exhaustive of the themes they discuss, and that will cultivate a field which can not be occupied by the monthlies and weeklies.

Believing thus, we enter upon our labors with confidence that they will meet the approbation of our Heavenly Father, and secure his blessing. We earnestly ask the sympathy and co-operation of all who love a pure literature, devoted to the sacred ends to which our work is dedicated.

GE
33
61
72
87
99
13
22
42

568

with
world,
der
the
on ;
up,
e of
the
e to

d all
ery-
de-
orial
tion

cupy
age
uss,

and
ends



HIRAM COLLEGE.

FACULTY.

B. A. HINSDALE, President, and Professor of Mental and Moral Science and Biblical Literature.
 I. N. DEMMON, Professor of the Greek and Latin Languages and Literature.
 W. S. ATKINSON, Professor of Mathematics and Astronomy.
 O. C. HILL, Principal of the Commercial and Chirographic Departments.
 A. J. SQUIRES, M. D., Lecturer on Chemistry and Physiology.
 Miss ELLEN JACKSON, Principal of the Ladies' Department.
 O. C. HUBBELL, Teacher of German.
 G. E. BARBER, Teacher of Latin.
 S. E. YOUNG and G. H. COLTON, Teachers in Scientific and English Departments.
 M. R. FRENCH, Teacher of Vocal and Instrumental Music.

COURSES OF STUDY.

THESE are six in number: Biblical, Classical, Scientific, Ladies', Teachers', and Commercial. Students who do not wish to take any of the prescribed courses, can, at the discretion of the Faculty, pursue such studies as they may select.

TUITION.

Regular Instructions, per Term,	\$7 00
Incidentals,	1 00
Penmanship,	6 00
Commercial Course,	15 00
Instrumental Music, (with use of Instrument,)	14 00
Penmanship, (Complete Course,)	15 00

BOARDING.

Good Boarding can be obtained from \$3.50 to \$4.00 per week. Rooms with necessary furniture for self-boarding can be obtained at reasonable rates. Many students board themselves, thereby greatly reducing their expenses. The necessary expenses of a Term's study range from \$50 to \$100.

LECTURES.

Biblical, Historical, Scientific, and Educational Lectures are delivered to the whole body of the students at short intervals during the year. A course of Lectures for Ministers, or those preparing for the Ministry, is given each Spring Term.

LOCATION.

Hiram is a pleasant village in Portage county, Ohio. In point of physical and moral health no more desirable location for a College can be found or desired.

MEANS OF ACCESS.

Hiram is four miles from Garrettsville, a station on the A. & G. W. Railway. A daily hack runs between these places.

CALENDAR--1870-71.

First Term commences Tuesday, August 23, 1870.
 First Term closes Friday, November 18, 1870.
 Second Term commences Tuesday, December 6, 1870.
 Second Term closes Friday, March 3, 1871.
 Third Term commences Tuesday, March 21, 1871.
 Third Term closes with Commencement Day, June 22, 1871.

For Catalogue or information, address

B. A. HINSDALE, President.

THE DAUGHTERS' COLLEGE, KENTUCKY.

THE FIFTEENTH SESSION.

THE DAUGHTERS' COLLEGE, near Harrodsburg, Ky., under the Presidency of John Augustus Williams, will receive a few additional Students any time after the

First Monday in September, 1870.

This School is limited in number, and select in the character of its pupils. None but those who desire to be thoroughly and practically educated, and are willing to devote their whole time and energy to study, are invited to apply for admission; and it is desirable that all applications be made as soon as possible.

CHARGES FOR BOARD AND EDUCATION REASONABLE.

Annual Session of Eleven Months divided into Three Terms.

No Exhibitions, Concerts, or Other Public Exercises by the Young Ladies allowed.

EXAMINATIONS PRIVATE AND THOROUGH.

VISITS FROM PATRONS REQUESTED.

FOR CIRCULARS, ADDRESS

C. E. & JOHN AUG. WILLIAMS.

H. S. BOSWORTH.

D. W. CHASE.

J. B. HALL.

BOSWORTH, CHASE & HALL,

(SUCCESSORS TO H. S. BOSWORTH.)

PUBLISHERS, BOOK-SELLERS, AND STATIONERS.

THE CHRISTIAN HYMN-BOOK.

SMALL EDITION. (Pearl, 48mo.)

Arabesque.....	\$0 65	Imitation Turkey, gilt edge.....	\$1 10
Arabesque, gilt back and burnished edge.....	75	Turkey Morocco, gilt edge.....	1 35
Arabesque, gilt edge.....	90	Turkey, with gilt clasp.....	2 00

MEDIUM EDITION. (Brevier, 24mo.)

Sheep Binding.....	\$0 90	Imitation Turkey, gilt edge.....	\$1 60
Arabesque.....	1 10	Turkey Morocco, gilt edge.....	2 00
Arabesque, gilt back and burnished edge.....	1 25	Turkey, with gilt clasp.....	2 75
Arabesque, gilt edge.....	1 40		

LARGE EDITION. (Pica, 12mo.)

Sheep Binding.....	\$2 00	Arabesque.....	\$2 50
		Turkey Morocco, beveled, antique gilt edge.....	\$4 00
		Turkey Morocco, beveled, extra gilt edge.....	4 50

WORKS OF A. CAMPBELL.

The Christian Baptist. Price, in cloth, \$3; arabesque, \$3.50.

The Christian System. By A. Campbell. Cloth, 12mo, \$1.50.

Christian Baptism. By Alex. Campbell. Sheep, \$1.50; half-bound, \$1.25.

Campbell and Purcell's Debate on Roman Catholicism. Cloth, 12mo, \$1.50.

Campbell and Owen's Debate, on all the Systems of Skepticism, Ancient and Modern. Price, \$1.75.

Familiar Lectures on the Pentateuch. Edited by W. T. Moore. Price, \$1.75.

Memoirs of Elder Thomas Campbell. By Alexander Campbell. 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

Living Oracles. Pocket edition, bound in cloth, 50 cents.

WILL SOON PUBLISH A NEW EDITION OF THE *Christian Sunday-School Library*, 50 vols., edited by Elder D. S. BURNET.

Other Sunday-School works in preparation, and will soon be announced.

The publication of *Sunday-School Libraries*, and of all Sunday-School requisites, is a distinct and rapidly-growing feature of our business.

The books of the American Sunday-School Union and Tract Society, or any other publications, supplied to order, at the current rates.

The attention of Authors and others is invited to our increased facilities for publishing Books, Pamphlets, Sermons, Tracts, etc.

Blank Books manufactured to order, of any desired Size, Ruling, Printing, or Binding.

Any book in print, in any department of literature and learning, will be forwarded by mail or express, on receipt of retail price. Orders solicited.

Letters of inquiry will have our immediate attention.

ADDRESS,

BOSWORTH, CHASE & HALL,

172 West Fourth-Street, Cincinnati.



AGENTS WANTED everywhere for that unique original work, the "BIBLE LOOKING-GLASS:" it has 624 octavo pages and 173 engravings, illustrating the varieties of human character and the qualities of the human heart. It is commended by the clergy and widely patronized by the best people. Our 16 page specimen book, with engravings and terms of this and other works, sent free on writing to HENRY HOWE, Publisher, 118 W. 4th St., Cin.O.

Also for

**Travels and Adventures of Celebrated Travelers,
IN THE PRINCIPAL COUNTRIES OF THE WORLD.**

Illustrated by Steel-Plates and Colored Engravings.

Also for

"Life and Death on the Ocean,"

And other attractive works.

Send for all our Circulars. We have business for people, men and women, young and old, in their own neighborhoods.



AGENTS WANTED for Middleton's celebrated National Oil Portraits, WASHINGTON, MRS. WASHINGTON, LINCOLN, etc. Also, for the two beautiful Chromos, "CHRIST BLESSING LITTLE CHILDREN," and "ASKING A BLESSING: A Scene at the Breakfast Table of an American Farmer," after the famous F. O. C. Darley. They are cheap, sell fast, and are delightful to canvass with, for they touch all good hearts. For 15-page Circular, with Terms and Outline Key, address HOWE & MIDDLETON, 118 W. 4th St., Cincinnati, O.

AGENTS WANTED FOR

OIL PORTRAIT

GENERAL
GEO. H. THOMAS

Painted by his friend and comrade, Gen. S. W. PRICE, the soldier-artist.

Beautiful Picture! Perfect Likeness! Speaks for itself! Size 18x22 inches.

Address R. W. CARROLL & CO., Publishers, 117 W. 4th St., Cincinnati, O.

GENERAL THOMAS sat for this

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAIT,

And wished his countrymen to know it was the only portrait with which he was satisfied. The original life-sized portrait is now at Washington, and Congress is negotiating for its purchase.

Our publication is an exact FAC SIMILE of the ORIGINAL except as to size, prepared under the eye of the artist.

It is 18 x 22 inches, and can be supplied with or without frame.

Every living soldier of Thomas will buy it.

The relatives of every soldier of Thomas will buy it.

Every admirer of the Great Hero will buy it.

The price is so reasonable that every body can afford to buy it.

Agents get such large commissions that they can better afford to sell it than any other article.

The work is so elegant and the likeness so perfect that the picture will sell itself.

It speaks for itself.

Agents applying should state what experience, if any, they have had as canvassers.

For terms, apply to

R. W. CARROLL & CO., Publishers,

No. 117 West Fourth-Street, CINCINNATI.

OPEN FIRES.

"In one room at least, in every country house, there should be the exhilarating air and influence of an open fire.

"I have seen respectability and amiability grouped over the air-tight stove; I have seen virtue and intelligence hovering over the register; but I have never seen true happiness in the family circle, where the faces were not illuminated by the blaze of an open fire-place."

—[DR. OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES.

**Slate Mantels,
Marble Mantels,
Enameled Grates,**

MANUFACTURED BY

C. B. EVANS & CO.,

South-East corner of Fourth-Street and Central-Avenue,

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

OUR NEW BOOK,

Giving full directions for Chimney Setting, Grate Building, etc., sent on application
by mail.

VALUABLE RELIGIOUS WORKS

PUBLISHED BY

R. W. CARROLL & CO.,

115 and 117 West Fourth-St., CINCINNATI.

I. The Living Pulpit of the Christian Church.

A Series of Discourses, Doctrinal and Practical, from Representative Men among the Disciples of Christ. With a brief Biographical Sketch and Steel Portrait of each Contributor. Arranged and Edited by W. T. MOORE.

8vo, tinted paper, crape cloth, \$4.75; library style, marble edges, \$5; full morocco, gilt edges, \$10.
(Sold by Agents.)

THIS work contains Discourses from D. S. BURNET, H. T. ANDERSON, THOMAS MUNNELL, L. L. PINKERTON, JAMES CHALLEN, L. B. WILKES, O. A. BURGESS, G. W. LONGAN, ROBERT GRAHAM, M. E. LARD, J. S. SWEENEY, W. H. HOPSON, W. K. PENDLETON, J. W. MCGARVEY, BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, T. P. HALEY, JOHN SHACKELFORD, J. S. LAMAR, DAVID WALK, WILLIAM BAXTER, C. L. LOOS, ISAAC ERRETT, A. S. HAYDEN, TOLBERT FANNING, W. T. MOORE, A. R. BENTON, and JOSEPH KING.

In calling attention to this valuable volume, there is one fact worthy of notice, namely, that in all the sermons of the twenty-eight contributors, scattered all over the United States, and written without any consultation, and without knowledge of the subjects to be treated by others, there has been no conflict of opinion—no contradiction, or difference of views—a fact showing that the great body of the Reformers is a unit on those vital and material questions which distinguish their Church organization from that of all others.

II. Reason and Revelation;

Or, The Province of Reason in Matters Pertaining to Divine Revelation Defined and Illustrated, and the Paramount Authority of the Holy Scriptures Vindicated.

By R. MILLIGAN, President of the College of the Bible in Kentucky University.

Crown 8vo. (Revised Edition.) Price, \$2.50.

It is painful to see the popular indifference that is every-where manifested for the Word of God. Very few people seem to believe the Bible with their whole heart, and hence but few tremble at its solemn precepts and warnings; very few seem to feel and acknowledge its paramount claims and authority. Most unconverted men have but little regard for it; and even in the Church its laws and its institutions are, by many, treated with more indifference than the petty rules and regulations of a borough police. . . .

The author's object is not so much to inquire into the origin and history of popular skepticism as to remove it; and, as far as possible, to enlighten the popular understanding; to assign to Reason her proper province, and to arouse to a sense of feeling and activity the slumbering conscience.

III. An Exposition and Defense of the Scheme of Redemption,

As it is Revealed and Taught in the Holy Scriptures.

By R. MILLIGAN, President of the College of the Bible in Kentucky University.

Crown 8vo, English cloth, beveled. With a Portrait of the Author. (Second edition.) \$2.50.

"In this work there is no attempt made to construct a system of any kind. That has already been done, and done perfectly, by the Spirit which reaches all things, yea, even the deep counsels and purposes of Jehovah. And whatever serves to draw away the minds and hearts of the people from the constant, earnest, and powerful study of the Divine system, whether it be in the form of a Catchism, a Creed, a Periodical, or a Newspaper, I can not but regard as an unqualified curse to our race. But whatever, on the other hand, serves to clear away the rubbish, the mists and fogs which human traditions and speculations have thrown over and around this system whatever serves to lead and to incline the people to study it more earnestly, comprehend it more fully love it more ardently, and reverence it more profoundly, I can not but regard as a great blessing to our race."—*Author's Preface.*

IV. The Family Companion:

A Book of Sermons on Various Subjects, Doctrinal and Practical, intended for the Edification and Comfort of the Disciples of Christ, and to aid the Honest Inquirer after Truth in finding the True Church.

By ELIJAH GOODWIN.

8vo, cloth, \$1.75.

This work has been heartily welcomed by the religious public, and has had a large sale. The present edition has been revised, enlarged, and improved.

V. Koinonia: The Weekly Contribution.

By JAMES CHALLEN.....18mo, stiff covers, 50 cents.

This work was written to present a simple, feasible, and Scriptural plan for the raising of funds for all religious and benevolent purposes in the House of God, it being well-known that the subject of finance is attended with serious difficulties in all Churches.

The above works sent, post paid, on receipt of the retail price—a special discount to preachers, who are solicited to act as Agents.

THE LEONARD SCOTT PUBLISHING CO.'S

REPRINTS OF BRITISH PERIODICALS.

The London Quarterly, Edinburgh, North British, and Westminster Reviews

Are published Quarterly in England, in January, April, July, and October.

BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE

IS MONTHLY.

By an arrangement with the British Publishers, whom we pay liberally, we receive sheets in advance of the publication in England, and are thereby enabled to place the reprints in the hands of subscribers almost as soon as they could procure the originals.

A word as to the wonderful cheapness of these Reprints. It is as much as any man of ordinary income can afford to subscribe for *one* of these Reviews in England. There, publications of this character are very expensive, and but few, even of the more attentive readers, take more than one of the Reviews. Here, however, these periodicals, which are printed with thorough fidelity to the English copy, are offered at prices which place them within reach of all, nay, which render it inexcusable for any person who has any taste for sound reading to be without them. Just think of it, *only Fifteen Dollars* for Blackwood, (monthly,) and four Reviews, (quarterly,) any one of which would cost, in England, more than this price.

Published and for Sale by

THE LEONARD SCOTT PUBLISHING CO.,

140 Fulton-street, New York.

CHRISTIAN TRACTS,

PUBLISHED BY R. W. CARROLL & CO.

JUST READY,

THE PLAN OF SALVATION.

BY ISAAC ERRETT.

THE Second Edition of this popular Sermon has been nearly exhausted in a month. It is one of the best Tracts for general interest ever prepared, and should have a wide circulation, its author being well known throughout the Christian Church and the entire country.

Single copies, 10 cents; per dozen, \$1; per hundred, \$6; five hundred, \$25; per thousand, \$40.

Orders by the 100 or 1,000 promptly filled.

Other Tracts will follow at stated intervals.

IN PRESS.—**The Connection Between Baptism and the Remission of Sins,** Historically considered. By W. K. PENDLETON, President of Bethany College. Same Price.

These Tracts are printed from clear type, on good paper, with neat Paper Covers.

R. W. CARROLL & CO., Publishers,

117 WEST FOURTH-ST, CINCINNATI.

BOOK CATALOGUES

PUBLISHED BY

R. W. CARROLL & CO.,

115 and 117 West Fourth-Street, CINCINNATI.

I. Carroll's Catalogue of Juvenile and Sunday School Books.

(1 vol., 18mo, 32 pages.) This is a complete Price-List of Books for the young, and is of great service to those who have the selecting of Sunday School Libraries, as well as to those who desire to make suitable presents to young folks.

R. W. C. & CO. furnish this Catalogue *free* upon application, or they send it by mail, post-paid, to any address, on receipt of a stamp.

II. Carroll's Practical Catalogue.

Being a Catalogue of Miscellaneous Books published in the United States, (1 vol., 16mo, 268 pages,) containing the titles of 3,000 books. This Catalogue is essential to those who wish to select works for Public or Private Libraries, and contains the substance of the Lists issued by various Publishers. It is revised from time to time.

R. W. C. & CO. send the Practical Catalogue to any address, by mail, *post-paid*, on receipt of 25 cents.

III. Carroll's Catalogue of Law-Books.

(1 vol., 16mo., 120 pages.) This is a complete List of Law-Books, with prices annexed.

R. W. C. & CO. furnish this Catalogue *free* on application, or send it to any address, post paid, on receipt of 10 cents.

IV. Carroll's Catalogue of Medical Books.

(1 vol., 18mo, 32 pages.) Supplied *free* on application, or sent to any address, *post-paid*, on receipt of stamp.

V. Carroll's Literary Register:

A Monthly Bulletin of New Books—supplied *free* on application, or sent a year upon payment of postage, or receipt of 25 cents.

N. B. In addition to their regular Catalogues, R. W. CARROLL & CO. will, on application, furnish detailed information in regard to

SCHOOL BOOKS,	MISCELLANEOUS BOOKS,
LAW BOOKS,	MEDICAL BOOKS,
SCIENTIFIC BOOKS,	THEOLOGICAL BOOKS,
BLANK BOOKS,	ALL KINDS OF STATIONERY.

R. W. CARROLL & CO. pay special attention to supplying Libraries.

R. W. CARROLL & CO.

have lately enlarged their store, and have every facility for attending to their large and increasing Wholesale Trade in every kind and variety of BOOKS AND STATIONERY.
Address

R. W. CARROLL & CO.,

**Publishers and Wholesale Booksellers and Stationers,
CINCINNATI, O.**

STANDARD UNIVERSALIST BOOKS,

PUBLISHED BY

WILLIAMSON & CANTWELL,

AT THE

Western Universalist Book Establishment and Office of "Star in the West,"
CINCINNATI, OHIO.

THE following works are particularly valuable to all who wish to understand the foundation principles of the Universalist faith:

Universalism a Practical Power.

By ELBRIDGE G. BROOKS, D. D. Embodies a thorough discussion of the questions at issue between Universalists and Partialists; well worthy of attention from all who wish to understand our faith in its relations to Life and Duty. Price, \$1.25.

Illustrations of the Divine Government.

By T. SOUTHWOOD SMITH, M. D. Fifth American Edition. 12mo. 396 pages. Price, \$1.25. A learned, candid, and forcible argument for the salvation of all men. By common consent, this work occupies the front rank among those devoted to the advocacy of Universalism.

Exposition and Defense of Universalism.

in a Series of Discourses, by Rev. I. D. WILLIAMSON, D. D. This volume contains fifteen sermons, on the following subjects: Introductory; Unity of God; Atonement; Death of Christ; Punishment; Forgiveness of Sins; Duration of Punishment; Judgment; The Resurrection; Destruction of Death; Nature of Salvation; Repentance; Faith; Influence of Universalism; Decision of Character a Religious Duty. 18mo. 227 pages. Price, 65 cents.

Argument for Christianity.

By Rev. I. D. WILLIAMSON, D. D. This Argument occupies 232 pages, 18mo. It is an earnest and forcible presentation of the evidences of Christianity, and a complete refutation of the objections commonly urged by unbelievers. Many thousands have been sold. Price, 65 cents.

Providence and Life.

Select Sermons preached in the Broadway Church, by Rev. E. H. CHAPIN, D. D. New and elegant edition, on tinted paper, beveled boards and gilt top, with likeness, and Biographical Introduction, prepared expressly for this edition, by Rev. A. D. MAYO. Contains twenty of Dr. Chapin's best Sermons. Sold only by subscription. Price, \$2. Agents wanted in all parts of the country.

Endless Misery Examined and Refuted.

DR. WILLIAMSON's popular work, of which several editions have been sold. Cloth. Price, 75 cents.

Philosophy of Universalism.

Or, Reasons for our Faith. By Rev. I. D. WILLIAMSON, D. D. One of the most valuable little works ever published. Two editions. Paper, 25 cents; cloth bound, 40 cents.

The above are published by Williamson & Cantwell, and, with the exception of "Providence and Life," which is sold by subscription only, will be sent by mail on receipt of the price. Address

WILLIAMSON & CANTWELL, Cincinnati, O.

"Give me liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely, according to conscience, above all liberties." *Hilton.*

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND FREE THOUGHT.

A Controversy between ARCHBISHOP PURCELL, of Cincinnati, and Rev. THOMAS VICKERS, of Cincinnati.

TOGETHER with an Appendix, containing the Encyclical Letter and Syllabus of Pope Pius IX, dated December 8, 1864, in the original Latin, with a faithful translation.

8vo, Paper. . . . Price, 75 cents.

Sent to any address, post-paid, on receipt of price. For sale by

R. W. CARROLL & CO.,
115 and 117 West Fourth-Street.

A BOOK FOR EVERY HOUSEHOLD.

VIEWS OF LIFE:

ON THE SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS QUESTIONS OF THE AGE.

BY W. T. MOORE.

THE Publishers desire to call especial attention to this new and valuable work, which has met with a generous reception by the reading public, and has been commended by the entire Eastern and Western Press, some of whose notices we give below.

The work has been carefully prepared, and contains, besides those Addresses which have attained such popularity as to be demanded in book form, several now printed for the first time.

CONTENTS.

Woman's Sphere and Responsibilities.

Our Utilitarianism and the Remedy.

The Present Age, a New Era.

Success, What it is, and How to Secure it.

Radicalism and Conservatism.

Woman—What She is, and how She should be Educated.

The Present Age and its Greatest Need.

Our Strength and Our Weakness.

Our Creed—Is it Evangelical?

Our Practice—Is it Evangelical?

The Gospel and the Poor.

Christ, Disturbing and Harmonizing Human Society.

NOTICES OF THE PRESS.

The author of this volume has attracted a good deal of attention the past twelve months, on account of his earnest appeals for religious tolerance, and his caustic criticisms of the position taken by the Association of Evangelical Ministers of this city, requiring all members of the Association to conform to a Procrustean rule. Mr. Moore held that the only proper test was the Word of God. He is an original thinker, and expresses himself with a good deal of vigor. He is clear and logical, and his style is persuasively eloquent and attractive. The volume embraces views on a wide range of subjects.—*Cincinnati Evening Chronicle*, May 14, 1869.

These Addresses do not discuss questions involving recondite theology, although they evince a deep insight into the doctrine of differences now agitating the world from Rome to Berlin. They are chiefly devoted to the consideration of the questions which, in an ethical point of view, are important to all.—*Cincinnati Enquirer*, May 22, 1869.

A religious feeling runs through these Addresses without flooding them.—*Philadelphia Press*.

The author is an independent thinker, and expresses himself forcibly, without ambiguity or undue prolixity. His themes involve many of the great social, political, and religious problems with which we have to do at the present time, and they are treated without reference to party, sect, or caste. It is worthy of a place in every young man's or young woman's library.—*Gospel Echo*.

Mr. Moore writes in an easy and popular style, and his book will be very acceptable to his many friends and admirers. The volume is issued in a style that does credit to American typography. In fact, a neater volume rarely comes to us with a London imprint.—*Cincinnati Gazette*, May 20, 1869.

The literary refinement and originality of thought in these addresses are marked features, and at once place the writer in the literary galaxy of the best magazine composers of the present age. The Addresses are preëminently practical; and the very fact that Mr. Moore grapples with the living issues of the present day, and boldly investigates every question relating to the amelioration of the human family, proves that he reaches far beyond the mere honor of a literary fame. The dominant prevailing thought in all these addresses is to correct the wrongs of society, to discover the religious, and moral, and educational disorders of the living world, and to prescribe the remedy; and on this account, if from no other, this fragrant offering should be patronized by all lovers of good order and a high state of morals. The author is a radical reformer, and aims at the extirpation of every social and religious wrong.—*American Christian Review*, June 4, 1869.

This young Western author has treated his subjects in an original and vigorous manner. The book is beautifully gotten up. Indeed, it is one of the handsomest productions issued from the American press.—*Am. Phreno. Journal*, July, 1869.

The author is well known as a popular public speaker. He possesses that ready flow of language and boldness of style which always impress an audience. The Addresses in this volume, which were delivered at college commencements, were designed chiefly for entertainment, and the reader will find them well adapted for that purpose, while those of a strictly religious character contain many thoughts of great value, presented in a very forcible style. The mechanical part of the work is admirable. The handsome cloth cover, the beautifully-tinted paper, and the large, open type constitute a dress which would render the most indifferent volume attractive.—*Apostolic Times*, May 27, 1869.

The author has selected themes that have a deep present interest and significance. In his handling of these themes, he shows that he is a thoughtful observer of what is taking place in the world in which he lives. His thoughts are those of a receptive, active mind; his culture that of a good general scholar, all set forth in strong and earnest language. The Addresses can hardly have failed to stimulate those to whom they were originally delivered to mental activity and moral seriousness. They will be welcomed by a wide circle of readers.—*Christian Standard*, May 18, 1869.

This book has the appearance of a series of neat and elegant rhetorical productions, stored away on toned paper, in handsome covers, for the pleasure of people who fancy such literature. A few paragraphs read in any part of the volume will show it to be not veneration, but solid timber. The discussions are

sharp, practical, and of the kind which common-sense people term "first-rate." We marked extensively for quotation, but end by quoting nothing, as our present space will not permit. The address defending the author's denominational views, while it will recommend the work to a large class, will limit the field of usefulness which it should have had.—*Christian World*, July 22, 1869.

This volume is replete with wise and beautiful thoughts, that can not fail to profit and delight the reader. The Addresses are eminently practical, and discuss their themes with a freshness and force of rare interest.—*Millennial Harbinger*, June, 1869.

This interesting volume of 350 pages has been laid on our table by the publishers, and we heartily commend it to the public as well worthy of a careful reading. The themes are well chosen and ably discussed.—*American Housewife*, Indianapolis.

These Addresses will well repay a reading. While we might possibly criticise, we find so much more to approve, that we commend them as worthy of a wide circulation. The style is excellent, and the subjects are discussed with more than ordinary ability.—*Christian Pioneer*.

The views of the author are, in an unusual degree, high-toned, enlightened, and liberal, combining much poetical warmth and insight with practical sense. They are set forth with an eloquent earnestness and in an admirable style.—*Home Journal*, (N. Y.), June 9, 1869.

INDIVIDUAL NOTICES.

The literary matter of the work has given me very sincere pleasure. The Addresses are all interesting and suggestive, and some of them of very great value. I trust, therefore, that the work will freely circulate. To our young men and women especially it presents views of the social and religious questions of the age, by a gentleman of ripe experience and close observation, which must prove both entertaining and instructive.—*J. S. Lamar*, Augusta, Georgia.

Moore's new book of Addresses is a beautiful and attractive work. It discusses topics of popular and living interest in a clear, forcible, and discriminating style. He carries his reader always with him, and generally favorably to his conclusions. It is readable and quite instructive. This is the *soul*. Carroll & Co. have given it a body exceedingly chaste, charming, and enduring.—*A. S. Hayden*, Eureka, Ill.

"Views of Life" is a beautiful volume, gotten up in good taste, and written in fine style, on great and important subjects. I hope that it will have a wide circulation.—*R. Milligan*, President of College of the Bible, Kentucky University.

The book contains the best productions of a pen that writes up men and things pretty much as they are, and furnishes Views of Life rather than old, dusty notions of half a century ago.—*Thomas Munnell*, Mt. Sterling, Ky.

I must be permitted to compliment the exquisite taste with which it is gotten up, and to express my gratitude at its publication. In these addresses there are many precious truths that will expand the intellect, warm the heart, and be of great credit to the author and benefit to the generation for which he so faithfully labors.—*John A. Brooks*, Winchester, Ky.

The work is elegantly printed, on tinted paper, and bound in English cloth, making a handsome 16mo volume of 352 pages.

Price, \$1.50.

Sent, post-paid, on receipt of price.

 Agents wanted to canvass for the work, to whom special terms will be made.

Address,

R. W. CARROLL & CO., Publishers,
115 and 117 West Fourth-Street, Cincinnati.

ATTRACTIVE JUVENILE WORKS

PUBLISHED BY

R. W. CARROLL & CO.

I.

THE LITTLE MONITOR SERIES,

By MRS. M. M. B. GOODWIN.

THIS is an entirely new series of books, written for young children. The stories are very interesting and attractive, the authoress being well known and appreciated as a writer for children. The set contains

**AUNT EUNICE'S FAIRY STORY,
MARY HOLMES,
DAISY; Or, THE LOST COW,**

**SAMMY STONE'S RED APPLES,
WILLIE WELCH,
CLARE'S MISSION.**

6 vols., in a neat box. Each volume illustrated. Price, per set, \$3.00

ADMIRABLY ADAPTED FOR SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

II.

THE ROLLING-STONE SERIES,

By HARRY CASTLEMON, AUTHOR OF THE "GUN-BOAT SERIES."

This new series of books, by the above popular author, is admirably adapted for boys of all ages. They are well written, free from any expressions to which the most fastidious mind could object, and may be safely placed in the Sunday school; and are, in fact, just such books as boys should read to enable them to become good and useful citizens. The set contains

TOM NEWCOMBE; Or, The Boy of Bad Habits.

GO AHEAD; Or, The Fisher-Boy's Motto.

NO MOSS; Or, the Career of a Rolling Stone.

Price \$1.50 per volume. 3 vols., in a neat box, \$4.50.

III.

THE GUN-BOAT SERIES,

By HARRY CASTLEMON.

This series of books is always popular, and has a constantly increasing sale. The circulation has been very large, about *THIRTY THOUSAND VOLUMES* having been issued. The set contains

**FRANK THE YOUNG NATURALIST,
FRANK IN THE WOODS,
FRANK ON THE PRAIRIE,**

**FRANK ON A GUN-BOAT,
FRANK BEFORE VICKSBURG,
FRANK ON THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI.**

6 vols., illustrated, in a neat box, \$7.50. Any volume sold separately, \$1.25.

R. W. CARROLL & CO., Publishers,

115 AND 117 WEST FOURTH-STREET.

PUBLISHERS' ANNOUNCEMENT.

R. W. CARROLL & CO. will issue regularly in January, April, July, and October,

"THE CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY,"

to be edited by the able and distinguished writers whose names are given on the first page of cover, assisted by a corps of regular contributors of equal ability.

"LARD'S QUARTERLY" having been discontinued, "THE CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY" will be the only magazine aspiring to fill the gap, and the publishers are determined to make it a permanent success.

"THE CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY" will contain 144 octavo pages in each number, printed from small pica type, clearly leaded, on heavy paper, and will, in mechanical execution, equal, if not excel, any magazine published in the country.

TERMS:

INVARIABLY CASH IN ADVANCE.

<i>Single subscribers, per annum</i>	<i>\$4 00</i>
<i>Clubs of six, " " " " " "</i>	<i>\$1 00</i>
<i>Clubs of twelve, " " " " " "</i>	<i>\$0 00</i>
<i>Clubs of twenty, " " " " " "</i>	<i>\$6 00</i>

HOW TO SEND MONEY.


Send by Draft, Post-office order, or Registered Letter, when possible. If necessary to send currency by mail, never risk more than \$4 in one letter. Money sent in accordance with these directions will be at our risk.

TO PREACHERS.

Any preacher sending us a club of six subscribers, and \$21, will be entitled to an extra copy for one year. Or, for a club of twelve, with \$40, to one copy free, and a copy of President Milligan's "Reason and Revelation," or a copy of "Goodwin's Family Companion." Or, for a club of twenty, with \$65, to a copy free, and a copy of "The Living Pulpit of the Christian Church," elegantly bound in cloth, or to a copy each of "Reason and Revelation" and "The Scheme of Redemption," by President Milligan.

TO AGENTS.

The Publishers offer special inducements to Preachers and others to act as agents, to canvass for "The Christian Quarterly," and will pay a liberal CASH commission for subscribers.

 All letters relating to the Literary Department of the Quarterly should be addressed to W. T. MOORE, care of R. W. Carroll & Co., Cincinnati.

All business communications should be addressed to

R. W. CARROLL & CO.,
Publishers of "The Christian Quarterly,"
115 and 117 West Fourth-Street, CINCINNATI.

R. W. CARROLL & CO.,
PUBLISHERS, BOOKSELLERS, AND STATIONERS,

115 AND 117 WEST FOURTH-STREET,

CINCINNATI.

HAVING enlarged and improved the premises occupied by us, and greatly increased our facilities for the transaction of business, we invite the attention of Wholesale Buyers to our

LARGE AND WELL-SELECTED STOCK OF
BOOKS AND STATIONERY,
OF EVERY IMAGINABLE KIND.

Which is offered on the most favorable terms. Among the great variety of articles sold by us may be found

SCHOOL-BOOKS
OF EVERY KIND USED IN THE SOUTH AND WEST,
Law-Books, Medical Books, Scientific Books, Theological Books, Agricultural Books,
AND ALL VARIETIES OF MISCELLANEOUS BOOKS.



INCLUDING

HISTORIES, BIOGRAPHIES, TRAVELS, & ILLUSTRATED WORKS.

ALSO, A FULL LINE OF

Plain and Fancy Letter and Note Papers and Envelopes, Foolscap and Flatcap Papers,
French Note-Papers, Gold Pens, Inkstands, Steel and Quill Pens, Lead-
Pencils, Chess-Boards, Paper Weights,

Card-Cases, Pocket-Books, Portfolios, Writing-Desks, Pocket Cutlery, Diaries, Memorandum
Scrap-Books, Etc., Etc.

 Send for our Lists of School-Books and Stationery. 

 All letters of inquiry promptly attended to, and correspondence invited.

R. W. CARROLL & CO.,
115 and 117 West Fourth-Street, Cincinnati.

RS,

ilities

old by

oks,

RRKS.

apers,

andum